DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 434 182 UD 033 113

AUTHOR Sunderman, Gail L.
TITLE Designing Title I Schoolwide Programs: A Comparison of Three Urban Districts.
INSTITUTION Johns Hopkins Univ., Baltimore, MD. Center for Social Organization of Schools.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 1999-04-00
NOTE 91p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Quebec, Canada, April 19-23, 1999).
CONTRACT R117D-40005; RJ96006301
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accountability; Case Studies; *Compensatory Education; Curriculum Development; Educational Change; Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Government; Instruction; Program Development; Program Implementation; *School Districts; State Government; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS Chicago Public Schools IL; Cleveland Public Schools OH; Detroit Public Schools MI; *Improving Americas Schools Act 1994 Title I

ABSTRACT

This paper examines how the federal accountability mandates affect the design and implementation of schoolwide programs under Title I of the Improving America's Schools Act. It considers the policies adopted by states and districts to meet the accountability mandates, and it examines, at the school level, how the implementation of an accountability framework affects the development of curriculum and instructional processes that allow teachers to work with students at different ability levels. The paper uses data from case studies of Ohio, Illinois, and Michigan, and three districts (Cleveland, Chicago, and Detroit, respectively) to examine these questions. The first section outlines the theoretical perspective of the research. The second describes the research design, and the third presents the findings. At state, district, and school levels there was a reliance on structural (organizational) changes of outcome controls to create pressure and place constraints on schools. These states and school districts incorporated the federal expectations into their accountability systems by adopting performance and content standards, core curriculum frameworks, and assessment systems. Schools were most likely to rely on organizational changes to accommodate the accountability mandates. Schools in Detroit were less likely to make the organizational changes that were observed in Chicago or Cleveland. The focus on standards-based reform has led to a more integrated approach to curriculum and assessment in Ohio and Illinois, but many questions remain about the implementation and effectiveness of standards-based reform. An appendix contains tables of study results for each school district. (Contains 12 tables and 23 references.) (SLD)

ED 434 182

Designing Title I Schoolwide Programs: A Comparison of Three Urban Districts

Gail L. Sunderman
Johns Hopkins University

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Gail Sunderman
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Prepared for presentation at the American Educational Research Association Annual Conference, Montreal, Canada, April 19-23, 1999. This research is sponsored in whole or in part by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) of the U.S. Department of Education (grant nos. R117D-40005 and RJ96006301). The content does not necessarily reflect the views of OERI or the Department of Education, or does mention or visual representation of trade names or commercial products constitute endorsement by any branch of the U.S. Government. Marian Amoa, James Choi, and Alexis Marotta provided research assistance.

Please address correspondence to: Gail L. Sunderman, Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, 3003 N. Charles Street, Baltimore, MD 21218; (410) 516-8825; gsunderman@csos.jhu.edu.

UD 033113

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Designing Title I Schoolwide Programs: A Comparison of Three Urban Districts

Gail L. Sunderman
Johns Hopkins University

The 1994 *Improving America's Schools Act* (IASA) mandates that rigorous national standards be applied to all students, including those receiving Title I services. To meet the new policy challenge, states and districts were required to develop content and performance standards that are applied to all students. States are to develop or adopt annual assessments to use to determine the performance of students and hold schools accountable. The 1995 legislation also expanded the number of Title I schoolwide projects by lowering the eligibility threshold to include schools with 50 percent low-income students.

A primary objective of curriculum standards (standards-based reform) is the opportunity they provide for schools to develop consistent and uniform curriculum goals for all students (Wong & Sunderman, 1997; O'Day & Smith, 1993). The expectation is that this should improve the performance of all students, including Title I students. According to advocates of standards-based reform, curriculum frameworks are intended to provide direction and vision that will lead to an improvement in curriculum content and instruction (O'Day & Smith, 1993). The goal is a structure where curriculum and assessment are aligned and state and district policies support reform at the school level. The development of an accountability framework is seen as way to change student outcomes by changing what is taught and how it is taught. It assumes that relying on local decision makers to make decisions about curriculum has failed to improve student outcomes.

This paper examines how the federal accountability mandates affect the design and implementation of Title I schoolwide programs. It pays attention to the policies adopted by states and districts to meet the federal accountability mandates. At the school level, it examines how the implementation of an accountability framework affects the development of curriculum and instructional practices that allow teachers to work with students of different ability levels (Barr and Dreeben, 1983). Since Title I schoolwide funds are the main source of discretionary funds, it asks what organizational changes schools make to accommodate an emphasis on accountability.

This paper uses data from case studies of three states (Ohio, Illinois, and Michigan) and three districts (Cleveland, Chicago, and Detroit) to examine these questions.[1] In the first section we outline the theoretical perspective that guides this research. This is followed by a description of the study's research design. The next section presents the findings. This includes a discussion of the policies and strategies adopted by the three states and three districts in this study to improve academic performance and support schools in their efforts. It then looks at how schools accommodated the increased focus on standards. The concluding section of the paper discusses the implications of the findings on schooling for disadvantaged students and Title I schoolwide policy.

Theoretical Perspective

The institutional literature gives us insights into how to interpret the design and implementation of Title I schoolwide programs (March and Olsen, 1989; Powell and DiMaggio, 1991; Scott and Meyer, 1994). Using this broader, institutional framework

[1] All school names as well as the names of interviewees are pseudonyms.

establishes the context within which schools operate and takes into account the intergovernmental aspects of educational policy. Particularly important is to determine what takes place at each organizational level and how the activities at one level establish the conditions and outcomes at another level (Barr and Dreeben, 1983). For example, the 1988 Hawkins-Stafford Amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act gave local school districts and schools greater flexibility to decide where and how to use the federal Title I resources. This allowed schools to depart from a reliance on programs that pulled students out of their regular classroom for the delivery of services and adopt whole school designs.

Research on the implementation of Title I schoolwide projects and resource utilization suggest that schoolwide programs have made important gains in reducing curricular and instructional fragmentation. Surveys of Title I schoolwide projects reveal that the greater flexibility allowed schoolwide programs increased cooperation and coordination across categorical programs (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993) and reduced the fragmentation that accompanied categorical Title I programs (Wong, Hedges, Borman, & D'Agostino, 1996). Increased curricular integration and reduced instructional fragmentation, the use of assessments that informed teachers of individual student achievement, teachers' knowledge of student progress, and additional instruction on specific skills contributed to improving student learning (Sunderman and Mickelsen, 1998; Wong, Sunderman, and Lee, 1997; Millsap, Turnbull, Moss, Birgham, Gamse, & Marks, 1992; Millsap, Moss, & Gamse, 1993; Stringfield, Billig, & Davis, 1991). At the same, the broader institutional arrangements that schools operate in continue to influence the design and implementation of schoolwide programs. For example, in a comparative

case study of schoolwide programs in Minneapolis and Houston, district level policies were found to shape the design and implementation of schoolwide programs (Wong, Sunderman, & Lee, 1997). Other researchers found that the overall quality of the district was more important than programmatic components in determining the quality of Title I programs (Millsap, et al, 1992).

A key question for this study was the extent to which standards-based reforms affect the design and implementation of Title I schoolwide programs. Does the adoption of standards, curriculum frameworks, and assessment contribute to reducing curricula and instructional fragmentation for students in schoolwide programs? Recent studies on standards-based reforms have highlighted a variety of issues, including a focus on the design, implementation, and political issues involved in state accountability systems (Ladd, 1996; Jennings, 1998), and changes in teaching practice in the context of specific reforms (Spillane and Zeuli, 1999; Sunderman and Mickelsen, 1998). This research seeks to broaden that inquiry by examining the inclusion of schools with schoolwide programs into the broader systemic reform movement.

Research Design

Cleveland, Chicago, and Detroit were selected for inclusion in this study. The three sites represent urban school districts in the Midwest that have high concentrations of low-income students. To identify schools for participation in the study, a regression analysis was used that examined the relationship between measures of student achievement in reading and math and socio-economic characteristics.[2] Four inner city

[2] The socio-economic variables include percent of students who qualified for free or reduced price lunch, the stability of the student population over the academic year, the percent of students who were African

elementary schools in each district that showed differences in student outcomes were selected (see appendix for tables describing various background characteristics of each school). Two of the four schools in each district had student outcomes that were higher than expected, and two had outcomes that were lower than expected, when social and demographic characteristics of the schools were controlled. A comparative case study methodology was used to examine (1) how schools design and implement Title I schoolwide projects, (2) how state and district school reform policies affect the implementation of Title I schoolwide projects, and (3) how standards are implemented in schools with schoolwide programs. Site visits were made to each district during the 1997-98 and 1998-99 school years. School visits, staff interviews, and classroom observations were conducted in the four schools in each district and documentary material collected. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with principals, teachers, Title I coordinators, and teaching assistants to determine how policy changes affected the organization of Title I schoolwide projects. These interviews focused on resource allocation, school vision, content and performance standards, curriculum and instructional practices, professional support to teachers, and community involvement. Documentary materials included the school improvement plan, school budget, personnel allocation, Title I program and budget information, and corrective action plans. Interviews with district administrators gather information about district policies, particular regarding accountability and district Title I guidelines.

American, Latino, Asian or American Indian, the percent of students with limited English proficiency, the average daily attendance, the size of the school, and whether or not the school had a special program designation, such as magnet school. Achievement scores were collected for seven years, 1990 to 1996. See William L. Yancey and Raj Thadani, 1997, "Identifying Exceptional Schools: Chicago, Illinois," for more on the methodology and results of the analysis.

In addition, district administrators were interviewed and documentary materials collected from the central administration. These interviews focused on the history of the Title I schoolwide program, how resources are used to support the schools, and the kinds of support (curriculum, instructional, assessment, and professional development) provided to the schools. Particular attention was paid to how districts interpreted and implemented the federal and state accountability mandates. Documentary materials included Title I policy guidelines, district reform policies, demographic information, district budgets, and school level achievement test scores.

State Policy and District Support to Help Schools Meet the Standards

The federal IASI Title I legislation is non-prescriptive, describing only general expectations for schools with schoolwide programs. Nonetheless, both states and districts have adopted policies or strategies that comply with federal accountability mandates. All three states in this study have developed content and performance standards and implemented statewide assessments. To meet the state requirements, districts have developed accountability systems (frameworks) that include establishing content and performance standards, developing curriculum guides, and adopting other strategies to hold schools accountable.

To be sure, the IASA Title I legislation is not the only impetus for state and local policymakers to establish performance standards and curriculum frameworks. Since the publication of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983, the federal government has increasingly encouraged states to adopt standards and hold schools accountable for student performance. This direction has since been reinforced by both the Bush and Clinton

administrations. When President Bush met with the nation's governors at the 1989 education summit, a consensus emerged on six educational goals to be achieved by the year 2000.[3] Subsequently, President Bush launched the *America 2000* strategy to bring local communities voluntarily into a network to accomplish these goals. However, without funding, there was little incentive to ensure the goals were met. When President Clinton took office in 1993, he formalized these initiatives as *Goals 2000.* Under this legislation, states and school districts were encouraged to develop content and performance standards in exchange for federal school-reform grants.

These initiatives underscore two directions in federal educational policy since the 1980s. First, is the increasing nexus between the federal level of government and state governments. Increasingly, the federal government has defined an educational agenda and encouraged states to adopt and implement this agenda (Sunderman, 1995). To accomplish this agenda, the federal government has broadened its reliance on block grants, the delegation of authority to the state government, and deregulation of federal guidelines. Second, a consensus has emerged among policymakers that America's schools must perform better if students are to acquire the skills necessary to participate in the global economy (Mintrom and Vergari, 1997). It is believed that a primary way to accomplish this goal is to set high standards and hold schools accountable for performance.

The accountability policies adopted by the three states we visited—Ohio, Illinois, and Michigan—have implications for both district policy and schools with Title I

[3] These goals include: (1) all children in the U.S. will start school ready to learn; (2) the high school graduation rate will be at least 90 percent; (3) students in grades 4, 8, and 12 will demonstrate competency in the core subjects; (4) U.S. students will be first in the world in mathematics and science achievement; (5)

schoolwide programs. These policies have brought both schools and districts within the same system of accountability where disadvantaged students are held to the same expectations as their more advantaged peers. States have also moved in other directions by targeting persistently low achieving districts and passing legislation intended to change the governance arrangements of school districts. In this section we outline the state accountability and governance legislation and examine the strategies and policies the three districts adopted to facilitate the state goals.

Ohio: In August 1997, the Ohio General Assembly passed Senate Bill 55 that put in place a number of academic accountability initiatives.[4] This bill established a rating system that outlined minimum performance standards that each district must meet. These include minimum scores on the Ohio Proficiency Exam, a minimum student attendance rate (93%), and a maximum dropout rate (3%). The bill also established a high school exit exam and increased the credit hours required for graduation. To improve reading scores of elementary students, the bill contains a "fourth grade guarantee," that is, fourth grade students who fail to pass the reading portion of the Ohio Fourth-Grade Proficiency Test will be retained beginning in the 2001-02 school year. Retention was extended to include students who are truant and fail two or more subjects.

To comply with the state accountability law, the state board of education developed an Ohio proficiency manual that states what is to be taught for each subject at each grade level. The Cleveland Public Schools developed a Course of Study that is aligned with the Ohio proficiency manual.

---

every adult will be literate and able to compete in the work force; and (6) schools will be safe, disciplined, and drug-free.

[4] Ohio General Assembly, Am. Sub. Senate Bill 55, August 1997.

In July 1997, the state legislature passed a bill (H.B. 269) that gave control of the Cleveland public schools to the mayor.[5] Modeled on similar legislation enacted in Illinois in 1995, the legislation gives the mayor the authority to appoint a nine-member school board and select a chief executive officer (CEO) to run the schools. The mayor appoints the nine board members from a list of 18 candidates nominated by a panel of parents, educators, and business leaders. The CEO, with board approval, has the authority to take corrective action in low performing schools. The plan was supported by Cleveland Tomorrow, a group representing the city's largest 50 corporations, and by the Greater Cleveland Growth Association, representing 5,000 area businesses. Republican lawmakers introduced the legislation.

The district has interpreted the state legislation (H.B. 269 and S.B. 55) and federal Title I legislation in a number of ways. First, there is a focus on improving academic achievement. According to one district administrator, "Improved student performance on the Ohio proficiency, of course, is the real bottom line."[6] Second, there is limited support for school autonomy where the district supports the development of a school-based academic achievement plan. Third, there is the goal of insuring that schools use their Title I money as one resource to support the overall mission of the school and that compensatory education is aligned with the major curricular areas in a school. "Title I programs in our schools are part of a larger, comprehensive plan to improve academic achievement."[7] These latter two objectives incorporate the schoolwide concept embedded in the federal legislation.

---

[5] Ohio General Assembly, Substitute House Bill Number 269, July 1997.
[6] District Office Administrator 1, Cleveland City Schools, Interview February 12, 1999.
[7] District Office Administrator 1, Cleveland City Schools, Interview February 12, 1999.

When we conducted our interviews (February 1999), the new CEO, appointed by the mayor under provisions of H.B. 269, had been on the job for just 11 weeks. These objectives were in place and articulated by the administrators we spoke with at that time. We believe they will remain priorities because of the constraints imposed by both the federal IASA and state legislation. At the very least, district administrators were cognizant of the focus on accountability: "The federal legislation, especially with the last reorganization, has really set in motion the whole focus on school improvement and a school's academic achievement."[8]

The primary mechanism in place to accomplish these objectives is the Academic Achievement Plan (AAP). Each school has a core team consisting of the principal, teachers, corporate partners, and parent and community representatives that are responsible for developing the AAP. The plan specifies an academic direction for the school, a mission statement, and the allocation of resources to support the plan. Title I resources are incorporated into that plan as an additional support to help schools achieve the goals they identified. The state supported this direction by consolidating the planning process to include one plan for academic achievement and Title I.

As part of the district's accountability system, schools are given responsibility for their daily operations, and are held accountable for student outcomes.[9] Two performance measures have been identified: improving student achievement as measured on the Ohio Proficiency tests and improving student attendance at school.[10] School improvement "targets" are identified for each school that take into account the past performance of the

[8] District Office Administrator 1, Funded Programs, Cleveland City Schools, Interview February 12, 1999.
[9] Cleveland City Public Schools, *Accountability in the Cleveland Public Schools: Overview of the District's Accountability System, Performance Targets for the 1997/98 School Year.* October 22, 1997.

school's population. For example, Lincoln, where 16.2 percent of the 4th grade cohort passed the 4th grade Ohio proficiency in 1996-97, had a target of 21.2 percent passing in 1997-98.[11] The attendance rate in 1996-97 was 91.0 percent; the target for 1997-98 was 91.7 percent. A third objective, improving the organizational efficiency and school climate, is measured through a school survey.

With the Ohio Proficiency test, many of the schools are focusing on proficiency literacy skills. To help schools meet these skills, the district adopted a new reading series that is more closely aligned with the state standards. The district is also providing a reading resource teacher to the schools for the primary grades (K-2). In January 1999, the new CEO introduced "warm up" activities in all the elementary schools (grades three through eight). These are exercises in the core curriculum areas for students to do for ten minutes at the start of each school day. They are intended to assist students in preparing for the Ohio Proficiency Test.

The district also administers two assessments in addition to the Ohio Proficiency test. One is the off-grade proficiency, administered in grades one through three. This tests students on the same areas as the Ohio proficiency and is intended to help schools track student progress. Students who are not doing well can be identified early, before they reach the fourth grade. The other test is an interim test for students in grades three

---

[10] Cleveland City Public Schools, *Accountability in the Cleveland Public Schools: Overview of the District's Accountability System, Performance Targets for the 1997/98 School Year.* October 22, 1997.

[11] Using a regression analysis, the district determined a predicted level of performance on the proficiency test based on students' performance on CAT reading tests, the schools' mobility rate, and poverty index. The predicted level of performance was then compared to the observed level of performance, and a target was established for the following year. Schools which performed at much higher than predicted rates were given lower improvement targets, and schools with much lower than expected performance were given higher improvement targets. Schools are evaluated only on those students who have been in the school from early October through the spring testing week. For more information, see, Cleveland City Public Schools, *Accountability in the Cleveland Public Schools: Overview of the District's Accountability System, Performance Targets for the 1997/98 School Year.* October 22, 1997.

through eight in reading and math. The data from this test are available within two weeks of the testing, "so two weeks after taking the test every classroom teacher knows what their youngsters did and knows their area of weakness."[12] The goal is to insure that students are performing at grade level. Commenting on the district testing policy, one administrator said:

"If you have this kind of data for every kid in your class who was present and took the test, nobody should fall through the cracks. No one should. If you had this kind of data at grades one, two, and three and you know the high stakes test is grade four, then you begin to use this data to provide support and to focus everyone on what it is you have to do. You miss not a single youngster."[13]

Illinois: To comply with Illinois Public Law 88-686, passed in August 1996, the Chicago Public Schools developed the Chicago Academic Standards (CAS) and Curriculum Framework Statements (CFS).[14] These define "what students should know and be able to do"[15] in four core curriculum areas--Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies. These local learning objectives must meet or exceed the goals established by the State Board of Education.[16] The Chicago standards and curriculum frameworks are "designed for all students, including special needs students and those with limited English proficiency."[17] They leave it up to the schools and individual teachers to adjust and adapt the instructional materials to meet the needs of the students being served. CPS identified grades 3, 6, 8, 10, and 12 as the benchmark grades for reporting progress to the public. Schools began implementing the current standards during the 1996-97 school year. Schools are assessed on the Illinois Goals Assessment

---

[11] District Office Administrator 2, Cleveland City Schools, February 12, 1999.
[13] District Office Administrator 2, Cleveland City Schools, February 12, 1999.
[14] Chicago School Reform Board of Trustees. (1997). *Expecting More: Higher Standards for Chicago's Students, Chicago Academic Standards and Frameworks.* Chicago: The Board of Education of the City of Chicago.
[15] Ibid.
[16] *The School Code of Illinois* (1996). Chapter 105, Article 2-3.63.

Program (IGAP), a state administered test, and the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS).[18] The central office administration is currently developing a district assessment that is aligned with the standards.

In Chicago, there are predictable consequences for poor performance. Schools are placed on a statewide Academic Watch list for not performing well on the IGAP, and schools are subject to academic probation or reconstitution by the district for poor performance on the ITBS.[19] Students are retained in grades 3, 6, 8 and 10 if they do not meet grade level proficiency on standardized tests.

To help low performing schools (that is, schools placed on probation), the district put in place a structure designed to support school improvement. This includes a School Operations Manager to assist the principal with the school's fiscal operations and a Probation Manager to oversee the school improvement process. In addition, schools on probation are required to work with an external partner chosen by the school and contracted to provide educational services to assist with the school improvement process. Instrumental to meeting the demands of the district's accountability process is Title I money. It is the primary resource available to schools on probation to pay the costs of the external partner.[20] In addition, using state Chapter 1 funds allocated to the central office, the district supports an after school program in all schools and summer school for

---

[17] Chicago School Reform Board of Trustees. (1997).

[18] Beginning in the spring of 1999, the state introduced a new state test, the Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) that will replace the IGAP.

[19] Elementary schools can be placed on "probation" when fewer than 15 percent of their students score above the national norms on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS). Schools are eligible for "reconstitution" if they do not improve after being on probation. Beginning in 1999, the district added a process called "reengineering." This is a step between probation and reconstitution adopted to help schools that are not improving on probation, but intended to avoid the extreme measure of reconstitution. When a school is reconstituted, the central office appoints a principal and all staff must re-apply for their positions.

[20] The Office of Accountability pays the costs of the external partnership during the first year of probation or reconstitution. During the second year, the cost is split evenly between the schools and the Office of Accountability, while the third year is paid entirely by the schools.

students in the benchmark grades that did not meet the district's promotion requirements.[21]

The district is also encouraging schools on probation to use their Title I money to support a focused approach to reading improvement. According to one district administrator, "we still find that too often schools use their discretionary funds, Title I funds, for a variety of different things. We are trying to get our elementary schools to understand that if reading is your concern, then you need to make a conscientious effort to focus on reading instruction."[22] To facilitate this goal, schools on probation are required to develop a reading improvement plan in addition to the school improvement plan. The idea behind the reading improvement plan is to have schools realign both their general and discretionary (Title I) funds to support a reading program. Since the plan is school-based, discretionary funds are the primary resource available to support the implementation of the reading plan.

Schools not on probation have greater flexibility in how they use their Title I funds and design their programs than those schools on probation. The probationary designation, which extends the authority of the central office to take corrective action in a school, places limits on school discretion. In those schools not on probation, school-based decision making guides the design and implementation of the schoolwide program, with central office services available upon request. Nonetheless, schools are still subject to review by the Office of Accountability and the constraints imposed by the district-wide emphasis on improving standardized test scores.

---

[21] The 1988 School Reform Act disbursed state Chapter 1 funds directly to the schools. Under the 1995 Amendatory Act, a portion of those funds was disbursed to the central administration.
[22] District Office Administrator, Chicago Public Schools, February 22,1999.

Michigan: The basic framework for improving student achievement was put in place by the state legislature in 1990 with the passage of Public Act 25. This law includes four components: 1) the development of a district and school improvement plan; 2) a core curriculum in every district; 3) an annual educational report to the public for every school; and 4) a school accreditation process which takes into account student achievement on the state assessments.[23] To meet the requirements of this act, the state developed core curriculum content standards and linked the Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP) to those standards. In 1993, P.A. 25 was amended to require districts to offer the State Board of Education's core academic curriculum by the 1997-98 school year. Beginning in the spring of 1996, the state began administering the High School Proficiency Test to high school juniors.[24] Until recently, the state could do little if a district failed to meet the performance standards. Sanctions existed for poor-performing schools, and included replacing the building administrator, provisions for parents to choose any accredited school within the district, and state take-over and closure.

The Detroit Public Schools developed a district curriculum framework in 1987 (called Strands and Objectives). This has since been modified to meet the state standards and objectives. In addition, the district adopted exit skills for grades K-5, beginning in 1998. These are aligned with the state performance standards and outline what a student should know at each grade level. Students who have not mastered the exit skills by the end of the school year can be retained. The board funds a summer exit skills academy

[23] Act No. 25, March 13, 1990, State of Michigan 85th Legislature, Regular Session of 1990.
[24] This test encountered stiff opposition from parents in 1997 in response to poor test results on the 1996 exam. Parents protested the administration of the test by taking advantage of an exemption intended to allow parents of developmentally disadvantage children a chance to decide whether or not they would take

that is mandatory for students not passing the exit skills. The district first introduced the exit skills in the primary grades (K-3), and has since expanded them through the fifth grade.

A recent focus of reform of the Detroit Public Schools has been on changing the formal institutional arrangements that govern the public schools. Like many big city school districts, the Detroit Public Schools have been under intense scrutiny by state lawmakers to improve academic achievement. Under pressure from the state, the district undertook a number of steps to reform. In September 1997, the board adopted a re-organizational plan that included eliminating the six area offices. This was intended to streamline the central administration and save money. As part of the re-organization, the board voted to eliminate 15 out of 45 administrative positions, including five area superintendents, in April 1998. In November 1997, the board ousted then Superintendent David Sneed and replaced him with Eddie Green, a long time Detroit school administrator.

Governance reform also includes attempts to pass legislation that would give the state the authority to take over the district. Governor Engler first introduced legislation that would give the state authority to take over low performing school districts in 1997. The proposed legislation would allow the state to take over the administration of a school district if more than 80 percent of its students failed the state proficiency test or if its dropout rate exceeded 25 percent. The plan failed to pass the legislature where the Democrats held a majority in the House and some Republicans opposed the plan in deference to maintaining local control.

---

the exam. In one affluent suburban district (the Birmingham school district), over half of the juniors were excused from taking the test under this exemption.

In January 1999, Governor Engler again proposed legislation that would allow a state takeover of a district school system. This time the legislation included only the Detroit district. This legislation, modeled on similar reform plans in Chicago, Baltimore, and Cleveland, puts the mayor in charge of the schools. Under the plan, the mayor has the authority to appoint a seven-member reform board. One member of the board includes the state Superintendent of Schools Arthur Ellis. It requires that a majority of the other members are Detroit residents. The new board in turn appoints a chief executive officer to head the schools. The bill contains provisions to retain the elected 11-member Detroit Board of Education in a non-binding advisory role to quell protests over the elimination of an elected board. The bill passed the Republican dominated legislature in March 1999 and was quickly signed into law by the governor.[25] Following passage of the legislation, the mayor appointed current superintendent, Eddie Green, as acting CEO.

This focus on governance change has fostered a sense of discontinuity in district leadership and contributed to fragmentation in district policy. It is not unusual for each change in administration to be accompanied by programmatic changes. For example, a cluster organization within the district was replaced with constellations following a recent re-organization. For one school we visited, this reorganization put the middle school that the elementary students go to in a different constellation. Frequent leadership change has reinforced a focus on the protection of turf by mid level administrators. Until they were eliminated, the area offices retained considerable authority over the schools in their area and the staffs in their office. To maintain control, there is a reliance on hierarchical

[25] The House approved the bill, 66-43, and the Senate approved the House version of the bill, 31-7. Darci McConnell and Chris Christoff, "School reform now needs names: Archer wants public to help choose

decision making, with many decisions, even minor ones, made by the superintendent. At the school level, much of the organizational change that accompanies the governance reform of the Detroit central office is decoupled from the day to day operations of the school. This is in part because site based management gave schools authority over program decisions at the school level.

Organizational Change at the School Level

In this section we looked for organizational changes at the school level associated with the adoption of accountability mandates. Three resources—the assignment of students to classes and teachers to classrooms, and the allocation of time to instruction—were identified as organizational responses taken by school administrators. These decisions are important because they are likely to impact instruction within the classroom. It is important to point out that the federal, state, and district accountability mandates created conditions that school administrators felt compelled to respond to. Title I resources often played a significant role in these changes since they are the major source of discretionary funds available to school administrators. We present our findings by district, while noting that the similarities between districts outweigh the differences. Our findings indicate that low performing schools were more likely to reassign teachers and regroup students to reduce class size while high performing schools were more likely to re-allocate time to increase instructional time. Only one school changed their curriculum to accommodate the standards. That school, a dual English-Spanish language immersion school, altered the emphasis to increase English language development.

---

board." *Detroit Free Press*, March 26, 1999.

Cleveland City Schools:

There are uneven sanctions in Cleveland for poor performance on the Ohio Proficiency test. Principals could be reassigned or lose their job if their school did not perform well, and test scores are publicly reported. The state's fourth grade guarantee does not take effect until the year 2002. Nonetheless, there was tremendous pressure on schools to improve. Three schools we visited—Carter, Sherman, and McKinley—did not perform well on the fourth grade Ohio Proficiency Exam. Sherman, a school we identified as a positive outlier school, saw a decline in the fourth grade proficiency test scores from 1996-97 and 1997-98 (see table 1). McKinley and Carter were both negative outlier schools in our analysis (see appendix). McKinley saw some improvement from 1996-97 to 1997-98 while Carter's test scores declined. Only Lincoln consistently performed well. In this section we contrast the organizational changes made in the Title I schoolwide program in three schools, Carter, Sherman, and Lincoln.

Table 1: Fourth grade Ohio Proficiency Examination passing rates, McKinley, Carter, Sherman, and Lincoln Elementary Schools, Cleveland City Schools, 1996-97 and 1997-98.

School	96-97 pass rate	97-98 pass rate	Target	Obs. Improve.
McKinley	0.0%	4.3%	5.0%	4.3%
Carter	5.3%	2.1%	8.3%	-3.2%
Sherman	10.8%	3.3%	15.8%	-7.5%
Lincoln	16.2%	37.5%	21.2%	21.3%
District-Elem.	14.1%	17.3%	19.1%	3.2%

Source: Cleveland City Schools, "Final Accountability Evaluation Report."

Carter Elementary is one of ten schools in Cleveland identified as a "lower quartile" school. This means they are performing well below expectations, particularly in reading, on the Ohio Proficiency test. Under pressure to improve test scores, the school

revised its AAP plan. As part of this revision, the school "wanted to include as a vital part of the plan the way we're using our Title I funds and our Title I teachers."[26] A primary focus of the revised AAP plan was to reduce class size and increase the number of teachers in each classroom.

Carter moved the Title I teachers into self-contained classrooms, especially at the fourth grade level, to reduce class size. This helped reduce class size in the fourth grade to eighteen students, compared to an average class size of 27 for the school. To accommodate the smaller class size, small group tutoring was eliminated. Commenting on the change, a former Title I teacher said: "It's much harder when you are dealing with eighteen to keep them focused because of the issues that they're bringing with them. So I feel that the Title I program has been watered down."[27] In other words, the benefit of working with small groups of low performing students had been lost.

In addition to using Title I resources, the school used other resources to reduce class size or increase the number of teachers or teaching assistants in each classroom. The principal used the substitute budget to bring in additional teachers, recruited retired senior volunteers to work with students in pull out groups or one-on-one, and reassigned special subject teachers (such as music) to work with students on reading in the weeks before the proficiency exam. The school converted storage rooms into "reading centers' where tutors or volunteers could work individually with students. The aim of this approach was to reduce group size as much as possible because "the greatest need is one-on-one help. They really need small, very small group interventions."[28]

---

[26] Principal interview, Carter Elementary, Cleveland City Schools, February 10, 1999.
[27] Fourth grade teacher interview, Carol Vobornik, Carter Elementary School, Cleveland City Schools, February 10, 1999.
[28] Principal interview, Carter Elementary, Cleveland City Schools, February 10, 1999.

Another strategy Carter used was to target particular grades and subjects where test scores are low. For example, one Title I teacher was working with fourth grade students on science to help them prepare for the proficiency exam. Students are tested on a practice proficiency exam to determine which outcomes they are weak in. The teacher then pulls students out to review and teach the science proficiency outcomes. Students are selected based on low scores on a particular outcome, and not necessarily because they are a low performing student. This change meant that the teaching of science reverted back to the regular classroom teacher. The school also assigned a Title I teacher to the third grade to work on reading since third grade reading scores were very low. This teacher either works in classroom with the classroom teacher or pulls students out for small group tutoring.

Sherman also regrouped students and teachers to take advantage of the reading resource teacher provided by the district. The reading resource teachers work with students "in the middle group that normally would fall through the cracks, so to speak,"[29] and Title I teachers address the needs of students in the bottom 36 percentile. The goal is to provide extra help to the students above the 36th percentile, but below the district proficiency requirements, to help them get to grade level and pass the proficiency test.

Lincoln reported the second highest proficiency test scores in the district on the 1998 Ohio proficiency exam. Only one school, with a passing rate of 41.7 percent, performed better than Lincoln.[30] The district policy that schools incorporate Title I as part of the AAP plan "helped us combine all of our efforts into one specific target or a few targets. So the main goal is to improve proficiency scores in the fourth grade. And

[29] Principal interview, Sherman Elementary, Cleveland City Schools, February 8, 1999.
[30] Data from the Cleveland City Schools, "Final Accountability Evaluation Report."

attendance rates—for those to increase as well."[31] Nonetheless, the school made few changes in the Title I program to accommodate the testing. Instead, the emphasis on testing increased a focus on academic subjects. Many special programs were eliminated to provide additional time for instruction, music, art, and P.E. classes were often used for instruction, and teachers devoted more time to teaching the learning outcomes from the proficiency test. The cut in the school's Title I allocation made the most significant impact on the program, resulting in five rather than seven Title I teachers.

Lincoln has continued to focus the Title I program on children having difficulty with reading. They have one Title I teacher that works with fourth grade students on reading and language arts and another that works with second grade students on reading and language arts. The teacher working with the second grade students evaluates the students at the beginning of the year "even if it's an informal oral evaluation to see where these children are."[32] She provides instruction to small groups of students or individuals, depending on their needs. She may be in a classroom forty or eighty minutes depending on the daily schedule. The school is experimenting with reducing class size in first grade. According to the principal, "It's the first grade level that is the hardest. It's the level that most children will repeat. . . So we thought, well, let's try to have an extra teacher instead and see if that makes a difference."

The computer program is also intended to reinforce the classroom curriculum by providing additional instruction to all students in the school. For example, when the science teacher introduced primates in the science lab, she asked the computer teacher to extend the lesson in the computer lab. As the date of the proficiency exam approached,

---

[31] Principal interview, Lincoln Elementary, Cleveland City Schools, February 9, 1999.
[32] Title I teacher interview, Lincoln Elementary, Cleveland City Schools, February 9, 1999.

teachers asked the computer teacher to reinforce writing in the lab. The computer lab was added at the beginning of the 1998-99 school year. The school had three computers in each classroom that they purchased using Ohio SchoolNet funds. However, they found that was not enough for effective instruction, and obtained a grant to purchase additional computers to establish a computer lab.

Chicago Public Schools:

Two of the schools we visited in Chicago—Fairfax and Cornell—had new principals beginning in November 1998 (see appendix for background characteristics of the four Chicago schools). In both cases, the principal inherited the Title I plan put in place by the previous principal or interim principal, as was the case at Fairfax. Fairfax, a school we identified as a positive outlier, continued many of the programs already in place. Cornell, a negative outlier school, was facing a teacher shortage. At the same time, the Title I program supported a large number of school assistants. The program lacked a coherent focus, which may account for why many teachers in the school could not identify how the Title I program operated. Cornell and Butler, another school we identified as a negative outlier, were both on probation. The fourth school, Montgomery (a positive outlier), also continued many of the Title I schoolwide programs already in place. A central component of the school's curricula program is the Success for All program (SFA), adopted in 1994.

The schools we visited in Chicago were under considerable pressure to improve test scores under the district's accountability policies. Table 2 presents the percent of students in each school scoring at or above national norms on the ITBS, the measure the district uses to track school progress. As already noted, there were predictable

consequences for both students and schools for poor performance. To understand the organizational changes schools made to accommodate the accountability mandates, we examined how schools responded to the district's retention policy. This policy seemed to have the greatest impact, at the school level, on how schools allocated Title I resources, particularly in low performing schools.

Table 2: Percentage of Students Scoring At or Above National Norms on the ITBS, Reading Comprehension and Math, Four Schools with Title I Schoolwide Projects, Chicago Public Schools, 1990-1998.

	Fairfax		Cornell		Montgomery		Butler		District Ave., grades 3-8	
Year	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math
1990	12.5	27.1	12.2	11.8	13.3	23.3	12.8	9.6	23.5	27.1
1991	12.8	28.5	12.8	13.9	13.4	24.4	10.5	11.6	21.8	26.6
1992	14.4	34.7	10.1	13.9	17.1	25.2	11.0	13.1	22.4	26.3
1993	21.1	28.9	12.4	15.0	32.0	33.1	12.8	9.9	26.8	30.1
1994	14.5	24.6	11.6	19.2	26.6	31.7	11.7	5.9	26.5	28.0
1995	15.4	27.7	10.9	17.2	32.5	34.5	10.2	8.1	26.5	29.8
1996	21.2	27.8	13.1	19.4	28.0	29.3	12.8	8.8	29.1	31.0
1997	25.5	33.3	12.9	21.3	22.3	25.1	11.7	17.1	30.3	35.9
1998	22.5	43.6	17.3	24.2	37.4	34.5	13.5	22.7	28.6	31.1

Source: Chicago Public Schools, Office of Accountability, Department of Research, Assessment, & Quality Reviews, *School Information Database*, http://acct.multi1.cps.k-12.us/

The district's retention policy poses two challenges for schools. First, unless teachers are provided alternative materials, retained students are likely to repeat the same curriculum they received the year previous to retention. Second, retaining students is likely to create an imbalance in the number of students between grades. The effects of

Table 3: Number of Classes and Student Enrollment by Grade for Chicago Public Schools, Grades One through Eight, FY 1999.

School	1st Grade		2nd Grade		3rd Grade		4th Grade		5th Grade		6th Grade		7th Grade		8th Grade	
	# Class	# Students	# Class	# Students	# Class	# Students	# Class	# Students	# Class	# Students	# Class	# Students	# Class	# Students	# Class	# Students
Fairfax	3	66	3	52	4	81	1	32	2	39	2	37	3	43	2	22
Montgmy.	5	149	7	175	5	139	4	141	4	133	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cornell	3	77	3	64	5	94	2	59	2	39	2[33]	66			2	62
Butler	4[34]	57	2	56	3	66	1	22	1	31	2[35]	26	1[36]	21	1	32

[33] Both of these classes are 6-7 splits.
[34] One of these classes is a 1-2 split.
[35] One of these classes is a 6-7 split.
[36] This class is a 7-8 split.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

retention are particularly evident in the third grade at Fairfax, Cornell, and Butler (see table 3). All three schools have between 37 percent to 66 percent more students in the third grade than in the fourth grade.[37] To address these challenges, the schools implemented a transition program for students retained in the third and sixth grades.[38] This program is designed to reduce class size in the benchmark grades, and provide an alternative curriculum. Title I funds often support the additional teachers.

Fairfax is one example where the school has added transition classes in the third grade to help lower class size. Two of the five third grade classes at Fairfax are transition classes. Each transition class has fifteen students. In Ms. Hansen's class, the students have been retained once or twice. In Ms. Taylor's class, there are seven students who are in the third grade for the first time, many who need extra help, and eight who have been retained. The remainder of the retained third-grade students were placed in regular third grade classes. The board provided curriculum materials for the transition class so students are not simply repeating the same curriculum they had before retention.[39] Teachers in regular classroom also received the board materials for use with the retained students.

Another strategy schools used to accommodate the retained students included assigning students to split grades. Both Cornell and Butler have 6^{th} - 7^{th} grade split classes, and Butler has a 7^{th} – 8^{th} grade split (see table 3). The district re-tests retained students in January, and if they do well, they are promoted, mid-year, to the next grade.

---

[37] There are 60 percent more students in 3^{rd} than 4^{th} grade at Fairfax, 37 percent more at Cornell, and 66 percent more at Butler.

[38] The district also mandates summer school for retained students. In addition, the district has a transition high school for retained 8^{th} grade students who reach the age of 15.

[39] The first year we visited these schools, 1997, retained students were simply repeating the same curriculum they had the previous year. The introduction of the transition classes represents recognition by the district of this practice.

This also means re-grouping students within the school. For example, six of Ms. Taylor's third grade students were promoted mid-year to the fourth grade. Five retained third graders where then moved from regular third grade classrooms into the transition class.

In response to the district retention policy, Montgomery decided to also fail 4th and 5th grade students who were more than one year below grade level. There was an equity rationale to this decision. According to the principal, this policy was intended to reduce the pressure on 3rd graders as well as increase the pressure on 4th and 5th graders to continue to work hard. It is also likely that retaining students at other grade levels will help to even out the distribution of students across grades. Montgomery uses Title I resources to reduce class size in all classes as well as reduce the number of students in reading groups. The school assigns retired teacher volunteers to the third grade to help tutor students needing extra help.

In Chicago, schools not on probation are under less pressure to allocate Title I funds to increase test scores at the benchmark grades. Montgomery has continued programs that provide additional instruction for students that are below grade level as well as develop an enrichment program for students at or above grade level. The principal commented, "we tend to forget about our students who are on level or above so we decided this year to use it (i.e., the computer lab) as an enrichment program for those students. . . They can go in there and do projects on anything they like, be it writing, or projects in science or they can just work on an individual basis where they are just competing with no one but themselves."[40] Students needing additional help receive instruction in the after school program (supported by the district) or through small group

tutoring. The school also has "walking reading," implemented as part of the Success for All program. Students spend 90 minutes a day in reading groups at their level. To support the reading program, the school uses Title I resources to hire tutors and reading teachers to insure the reading groups are smaller than the regular classroom. The school also supports the emphasis on reading and writing by allocating a portion of Title I money to purchase reading materials, a computer writing program, and to update classroom libraries. After a two year decline in reading and math scores (see table 2), the district notified the school that if scores continued to fall, they would be eligible for probation. This promoted the school to re-evaluate their instructional program and make modifications to insure test score improvement

The school also has a focus on professional development. The principal requires teachers to attend at least two conferences or workshops a year. Using money from a state grant, the school put extra money towards substitute teachers to allow more teachers time off to attend workshops. To prepare for the test, the school adopted a six-day reading week with five days are devoted to reading, vocabulary, and language arts, and the sixth day to test preparation.

Detroit Public Schools:

The four schools we visited in Detroit are Adams, Roosevelt, Washington, and Sinclair. Using 1996 Metropolitan Achievement Test scores, Washington and Sinclair were identified as positive outlier schools, and Adams and Roosevelt as negative outlier schools (see appendix). Adams has a dual language immersion program in English and Spanish. The school started in the fall of 1992 with a literacy program for 0-3 year olds,

[40] Principal interview, Montgomery Elementary, Chicago Public Schools, December 14, 1998.

a pre-Kindergarten for 4 year olds, kindergarten, and first grade. Each year a grade level was added, with a seventh grade added in the fall of 1998. Students may enter the program at any grade level if their literacy skills in Spanish and English are on or above grade level, and entering students are tested on their literacy skills. The other three schools are pre-kindergarten to fifth grade. All four schools are empowered schools, that is, they practice site-based management and shared decision making. About twenty percent of Roosevelt's students are Hmong, while Washington and Sinclair are predominately African American. Washington has been recognized by the state for their Title I program. Sinclair, which has had its own set of exit skills for many years, was a model for the district's exit skills. According to one teacher, ". . .really our exit skills are Detroit's exit skills."[41]

The schools we visited in Detroit made few schoolwide organizational changes in their Title I program to accommodate the accountability mandates. For the most part, the four schools continued the program that was in place. This included strategies that provided additional instruction to the lowest performing students. All four schools had after school programs and a summer school program that is mandatory for students not meeting the exit skills requirements. They continued pullout and push-in programs to provide instruction to students needing extra help. This often included additional instruction to help students prepare for the MEAP exam. Finally, Title I instruction focused on meeting the academic needs of individual students.

Roosevelt is one example of how a school in Detroit used their Title I funds. The Title I program is organized to provide additional instructional time to students in the school. The school has a Title I teacher with expertise in reading that runs an accelerated

[41] Title I Coordinator, Sinclair Academy, Detroit Public Schools, January 20, 1999.

reading program for all students in the school. Using a computer program, students are tested on reading comprehension to determine their grade level. They take books out to read that on at their reading level and take a computerized test on the book when they finish. The goal is to measure individual progress in reading. The Title I teacher and two teaching assistants provide small group tutoring in reading to students needing extra help. In addition, the school has an extended day program that stresses basic reading skills and helps upper grade students with MEAP preparation. To help with math skills, there is a math teacher that works in the classroom with the upper grades.

According to the principal, the district's core curriculum and MEAP test has helped to focus the instructional program on particular skills and the sequencing of instruction. "You want to make sure the child has a fair chance of doing well, so you want to make sure the child has been taught the skills that will be tested."[42] Several teachers credited the exit skills with keeping them on target. A third grade teacher, commenting on how the exit skills changed her teaching, said: "You can't do anything but be on target if you are following the exit skills. I mean, this is telling you exactly what to do. To me, it's even better than using your curriculum guide because what they have done is taken the curriculum and broken it down into specific skills that they want the kids to have. I stay on target and I'm finding extra supplemental materials to focus right on what they're supposed to know."[43]

Roosevelt is facing constraints of another sort. Because of constant growth over the past few years, the school is short of classrooms. The school had to cancel their extended day kindergarten program because of lack of space. To help prepare for the

[42] Principal interview, Roosevelt Elementary, Detroit Public Schools, March 5, 1999.
[43] Third grade teacher interview, Roosevelt Elementary, Detroit Public Schools, March 6, 1999.

MEAP, the school moved social studies out of homeroom and made it a special class. This also was eliminated because of lack of space and moved back into the homeroom.

A different strategy was adopted by Adams, which altered the focus of their dual language program in response to the MEAP testing. For several years, beginning in the primary grades (K-2), reading was taught in Spanish, and up to 90 percent of instruction in the content areas was conducted in Spanish. Formal reading in English was introduced in the third grade. Academic instruction in English was then gradually increased each year until it reached 50 percent in English and 50 percent in Spanish by the fifth grade. Since both the MEAP test and the exit skills place an emphasis on English language skills, the school felt at a disadvantage, even when their test scores on a Spanish language test were satisfactory. The fourth grade reading scores on the 1996-97 MEAP indicated that a smaller percentage of students scored in the satisfactory category in 1996-97 than in 1995-96.[44] To accommodate MEAP testing the school has altered its dual language program by reducing the focus on Spanish and introducing English reading earlier. In the first grade, students are now taught in their native language, and English speakers learn oral Spanish as a second language and Spanish speakers learn oral English as a second language. Pre-kindergartens are introduced to pre-reading skills in English. At the fourth grade level, students practice the skills tested on the MEAP in English.

Conclusions and Implications

The assumption behind the adoption of standards, curriculum frameworks, and assessments is that they will alter teaching practice and improve learning. In this paper

[44] Susan C. Barfield (1997). *Summative Evaluation of the Two-Way Immersion Program at [Adams], 1994-97.* Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

we examined the kinds of decisions made at various levels of the school system (state, district, and school) to incorporate the federal legislative expectations. At all three levels, there was a reliance on structural (organizational changes) or outcome controls to create pressure and place constraints on schools. The three states and districts examined in this study incorporated the federal legislative expectations into their accountability systems by adopting performance and content standards, core curriculum frameworks, and assessment systems. All three districts are providing additional test score information to teachers to help them monitor student progress. This may help teachers identify students who are not doing well on standardized tests, but it also assumes that teaching the content that will be covered on the test will benefit students educationally.

Schools were most likely to rely on organizational changes, particularly reducing class size, to accommodate the accountability mandates. In schools under less pressure to improve test scores, administrators were less likely to reduce class size and instead added opportunities for students to receive additional instruction on the same curriculum that they received in the classroom. It is unclear whether reducing class size is a promising strategy to improve test scores. Decisions about class size must be taken into account, along with the distribution of student aptitude within a class, when teachers organize students for instruction. Thus, the teacher's observation that the reduced class size made instruction more difficult makes sense because it changes how teachers group students for instruction.

Further, Title I schoolwide resources provide an important resource for both schools and districts. Chicago requires schools on probation to use their Title I funds to support school improvement, and Cleveland requires Title I planning to be part of the

overall school planning process. Because of the flexibility built into the schoolwide program, Title I resources offered an important mechanism at the school level to link the standards-based reforms to schooling practices.

The schools in Detroit were less likely to make the same organizational changes we observed in Chicago or Cleveland. For the most part, they continued the Title I schoolwide programs already in place. This may be because the standards movement lacked sufficient support within a district consumed by management changes. It is also likely to reflect the variety of approaches the state has adopted to school reform, moving from finance reform in the mid-1980s, to a standards-based accountability framework in the early 1990s, to governance reform by 1999. Adopting many different policies can contribute to fragmentation by creating competing goals and organizational structures.

The focus on standards-based reform has led to a more integrated approach to curriculum and assessment in at least two states, Ohio and Illinois. Different institutional levels, the state and district, have developed mechanisms designed to further the goals of standards-based accountability. Moreover, by including schoolwide programs within the same accountability framework, Title I services are expected to align with the state and district performance standards.

Notwithstanding the increased integration at the state and district level, a number of questions remain about standards-based reform. First, does standards-based reform lead to the kind of changes in instructional practices desired? Clearly, when teachers teach to the test, there is a clear correlation between what is taught and what is tested. But, equally important is instructional pacing and appropriate level of instruction. Teachers must be able to accommodate instruction to the needs of students with differing

levels of ability and learning rates. Second, does standards-based reform lead to the kind of grouping arrangements that facilitate student learning? This research showed that changes in how students are grouped is a frequent response of school administrators to the constraints imposed by the current accountability systems. The challenge is to help teachers develop grouping arrangements that can be instructionally effective. Finally, are standardized assessments an appropriate measure of accountability? Most often, standardized assessments are used to report school level improvement. The practice of linking accountability sanctions to school level performance is likely to create constraints that encourages the selective use of assessment data to improve the schoolwide test score average. Districts need to develop other measures of school performance that support effective school and classroom organization. In addition, ways need to be found to insure standardized assessments are useful to teachers. This means they must by used to provide teachers with knowledge of what an individual student has learned and what remains to be learned, a task vary different from reporting school level performance.

Clearly, more research is needed on the impact of standards-based reform on the curriculum students receive and instructional practices used by teachers. Districts can assist schools by establishing an infrastructure that provides additional professional development specifically design to help schools understand effective uses of their Title I resources. Policymakers need to understand the implications of standards for student learning as well as how schools use their resources in light of the emphasis on accountability as they move forward with Title I schoolwide policy.

References

Barr, R. & Dreeben, R. (1983). *How Schools Work.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Chicago School Reform Board of Trustees (1997). *Expecting More: Higher Standards for Chicago's students, Chicago Academic Standards and Frameworks.* Chicago: Board of Education of the City of Chicago.

Gamoran, Adam (1986). "Instructional and Institutional Effects of Ability Grouping," *Sociology of Education, 59:* 185-198.

Jennings, John, F. (1998). *Why National Standards and Tests? Politics and the Quest for Better Schools.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Kim, Jeong-Ran (1998). "Implementation of Title I Schoolwide Projects and their Impact on Schools." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Conference, San Diego, CA.

Kirst, M. (1988). "The Federal Role and Chapter 1: Rethinking Some Basic Assumptions," in D. Doyle & B. Cooper, eds. *Federal Aid to the Disadvantaged: What Future for Chapter 1?* London: Falmer Press.

Ladd, Helen R., ed. (1996). *Holding Schools Accountable: Performance-Based Reform in Education.* Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

March, James G. & Johan P. Olsen (1989). *Rediscovering Institutions: The Organizational Basis of Politics.* New York: The Free Press.

Millsap, M. A., et al. (1992). *The Chapter 1 Implementation Study: Interim Report.* Washington, DC: The U.S. Department of Education.

Millsap, M. A., Moss, M., & Gamse, B. (1993). *The Chapter 1 Implementation Study: Final Report.* Washington, DC: The U.S. Department of Education.

Mintrom, Michael & Sandra Vergari (1997). "Recent Efforts to Improve Public Education in the United States: Intergovernmental Politics and Accountability Issues." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC.

O'Day, J. A. & Smith, M. S. (1993). "Systemic Reform and Educational Opportunity," in Susan H. Fuhrman, ed. *Designing Coherent Educational Policy.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Powell, Walter W. & Paul J. DiMaggio, eds. (1991). *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Schenck, E. A. & Beckstrom, S. (1993). *Chapter 1 Schoolwide Project Study: Final Report.* Washington, DC: The U.S. Department of Education, Office of the Undersecretary.

Scott, W. Roosevelt & John W. Meyer (1994). *Institutional Environments and Organizations.* Thousands Oaks: Sage Publications.

Spillane, James F. and John S. Zeuli (1999). "Reform and Teaching: Exploring Patterns of Practice in the Context of National and State Mathematics Reforms," *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 21:* 1-27.

Stringfield, S., Billig, S. & Davis, A. (1991). "Chapter 1 Program Improvement: Cause for Cautious Optimism and a Call for Much More Research," *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 13: 399-406.

Sunderman, Gail L. (1995). *The Politics of School Reform: The Educational Excellence Movement and State Policymaking.* Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Chicago.

Sunderman, Gail L. and Heidi Mickelsen (1998). "Implementing Title I Schoolwide Projects in a Complex Policy Environment: Integrating Standards and School Reform in the Chicago Public Schools." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Conference, San Diego, CA.

Wong, K. K. and Sunderman, G. L. (1997). *The Effects of Local Reform on Title I Schoolwide Projects: Lessons from Philadelphia.* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Conference, Chicago, Ill.

Wong, K. K., Sunderman, G. L., & Lee, J. (1997). "Redesigning the Federal Compensatory Education Program: Lessons from the Implementation of Title I Schoolwide Projects," in M.C. Wang & K. K. Wong, eds. *Implementing School Reform: Practice and Policy Imperatives.* Philadelphia: Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education.

Wong, K. K., Hedges, L.V., Borman, G. D. & D'Agostino, J. V. (1996). *Final Report Prospects: Special Analyses.* Prepared for the U.S. Department of Education, Office of the Undersecretary.

Yancey, W. L. & Thadani, R. (1997). *Identifying Exceptional Schools: Chicago, Illinois.* Laboratory for Student Success, Center for Research on Human Development and Education, Temple University.

Appendix
Chicago Public Schools

Table 1: Summary of Average and Expected Achievement Scores and the Residual for Students at Four Title I Schoolwide Projects, Iowa Test of Basic Skills, Chicago Public Schools, Academic Years 1990-91 to 1995-96

	Math			*Reading*		
School	*Average*	*Expected*	*Residual*	*Average*	*Expected*	*Residual*
Fairfax	27.84	16.94	10.93	15.99	14.61	1.37
Montgomery	28.07	21.17	6.94	23.27	14.14	9.13
Cornell	15.57	22.49	-6.89	11.87	20.27	-8.40
Butler	9.90	18.77	-8.85	11.69	16.87	-5.19

Source: William L. Yancey & Raj Thadani (1997). *Identifying Exceptional Schools: Chicago, Illinois.* Laboratory for Student Success, Center for Research on Human Development and Education, Temple University.

Table 2: Demographic and School Characteristics for Students at Four Title I Schoolwide Projects and the District, Chicago Public Schools, 1996-97.

	Fairfax	**Montgomery**	**Cornell**	**Butler**	**District**
Enrollment	441	956	667	494	421,334
% White	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	11.3
% African Amer.	100	0.1	100	100	54.7
% Hispanic	0.0	99.0	0.0	0.0	30.6
% Asian	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	3.2
% Native American	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
% LEP	0.0	59.0	0.0	0.0	15.4
% Low Income	95.5	98.1	86.7	99.8	83.2
% Mobility	34.1	24.1	24.5	32.3	29.0
% Daily Attend.	92.7	94.2	91.7	91.9	90.6
Year Schoolwide	1992	1995	1994	1992	

Source: Chicago Public Schools

Table 3: Demographic and School Characteristics for Students at Four Title I Schoolwide Projects and the District, Chicago Public Schools, 1997-98.

	Fairfax	Montgomery	Cornell	Butler	CPS
Enrollment	448	936	659	452	428184
% White	0.0	0.9	0.3	0.0	10.3
% African Amer.	100	0.2	99.7	100	53.7
% Hispanic	0.0	98.9	0.0	0.0	32.6
% Asian	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2
% Native American	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
% LEP	0.0	62.7	0.0	0.0	16.1
% Low Income	96.9	98.0	89.4	98.2	84.8
% Mobility	44.4	29.0	20.1	32.8	28.5
% Daily Attend.	96.9	94.6	92.6	92.5	91.5
Year Schoolwide	1992	1995	1994	1992	

Source: Chicago Public Schools

Table 4: School Budget, State Chapter 1, and Federal Title I Budget for Four Schools with Title I Schoolwide Projects, Chicago Public Schools, FY 1997-98.

School	School Budget	State Chapter 1	Federal Title I	Total Title I	% of Total Budget
Fairfax	$2,441,100	$318,960	$299,398	$ 618,358	25.3%
Montgomery	$4,790,140	$695,996	$338,803	$1,034,799	21.6%
Cornell	$3,056,443	$414,000	$269,703	$ 683,703	22.4%
Butler	$2,888,184	$337,680	$345,064	$ 682,744	23.6%

Source: School budget and *School Improvement Plan for Advancing Academic Achievement*, for each of the four schools, 1997. Data for Montgomery is for 1996-97.

Table 5: Per Pupil Funding: Total School Revenues, Federal Title I, and State Chapter 1, Four Title I Schoolwide Projects, Chicago Public Schools, FY 1997-98.

School	Number of Students	School Revenues	Federal Title I	State Chapter 1	Total Title I
Fairfax	448	$ 5448.88	$ 668.30	$ 711.96	$ 1380.26
Montgomery	936	5117.67	361.97	743.59	1105.55
Cornell	659	4638.00	409.26	628.22	1037.49
Butler	452	6389.99	763.42	747.08	1510.50
District	409,499	2589.14	464.51	637.36	1101.87

Source: School budget and *School Improvement Plan for Advancing Academic Achievement*, for each of the four schools, 1997; Enrollment date, Chicago Public Schools, 1997.

Cleveland Public Schools

Table 1: Summary of Actual and Expected Achievement Scores and the Residual for Students at Four Title I Schoolwide Projects, California Achievement Test, Reading, Cleveland Public Schools, Academic Years 1995 and 1996

	Actual		*Expected*	*Residual*
School	*1995*	*1996*	*1996*	*1995-96*
Carter	36.7	36.9	42.2	-6.3
McKinley	39.1	36.7	42.1	-4.9
Sherman	49.5	47.9	42.8	5.6
Lincoln	52.0	53.0	43.9	8.0

Source: William L. Yancey & Raj Thadani (1997). *Identifying Exceptional Schools in Cleveland.*. Laboratory for Student Success, Center for Research on Human Development and Education, Temple University.

Table 2: Demographic and School Characteristics for Students in Four Title I Schoolwide Projects and the District, Cleveland Public Schools, 1996-97

	Carter	McKinley	Sherman	Lincoln	District
Enrollment	320	516	616	562	71,344
% White	1.4	2.2	37.2	1.8	
% African American	97.2	97.0	18.0	95.8	
% Hispanic	0.8	0.2	43.4	2.3	
% Asian	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.0	
% Native American	0.6	0.0	0.5	0.0	
% LEP	0.0	0.0	25.4	.0017	
% Low Income	96.2	95.0	95.8	96.3	86.4
% Mobility	32.5	29.0	21.6	16.7	19.6
Year Schoolwide	1996	1995	1989	1990	

Source: Cleveland City School District, Assessment & Information Services, *Building Profiles: Data for 1996-97 School Year, Three-Year Baseline Data, Elementary Schools*, October 1997.

Table 3a: School Budget and Federal Title I Budget for Four Schools with Title I Schoolwide Projects, Cleveland Public Schools, FY 1997-98

School	School Budget	Federal Title I	Title I as % of Total Budget
Lincoln	2,040,671	342,040	16.76%
McKinley	2,170,044	297,160	13.69%
Carter	1,668,817	195,840	11.74%
Sherman	2,260,450	363,800	16.09%
District	650,356,986	34,942,514	5.37%

Source: School Budget for each school 1997-98; district data from *Cleveland City School District Comprehensive Annual Financial Report*, FY 1998.

Table 3b: Per Pupil Funding: Total School Revenues, Federal Title I, Four Title I Schoolwide Projects, Cleveland Public Schools, FY 1997-98.

School	Number of Students	School Revenues	Federal Title I
Lincoln	525	$3886.99	$651.51
McKinley	506	$4288.63	$587.27
Carter	421	$3963.94	$465.18
Sherman	569	$3972.67	$639.37
District	73,312	$8871.09	$471.88

Source: School Budget for each school 1998-99; calculations for each school are our own, district data from *Cleveland City School District Comprehensive Annual Financial Report*, FY 1998.

Detroit Public Schools

Table 1: Summary of Actual and Expected Achievement Scores and the residual for Student at Four Title I Schoolwide Projects, Metropolitan Achievement Tests, Detroit Public Schools, 1996.

		Read			*Math*	
School	*Average*	*Expected*	*Residual*	*Average*	*Expected*	*Residual*
Adams	14	44.6	-30.6	16	42.3	-26.3
Roosevelt	15	36.6	-21.6	21	36.7	-15.7
Washington	58	39.4	18.6	63	38.0	25.0
Sinclair	67	39.1	27.9	59	37.8	21.2

Source: Personnel communication with William L. Yancey, Temple University (September 24, 1997), "Results of Multiple Regression Analyses of Reading and Math Achievement (MAT) Detroit Elementary and Middle Schools, 1996."

Table 2: Demographic and School Characteristics for Students in Four Title I Schoolwide Projects, Detroit Public Schools, 1996-97

	Adams	Roosevelt	Washington	Sinclair	District
Enrollment	**460**	**728**	**564**	**781**	**183,447**
% African American	**18.0**	**78.0**	**95.0**	**100**	**90.69**
% White					**5.23**
% Hispanic					**2.83**
% Asian					**1.00**
% Native American					**.25**
% Free & Reduced	**71.0**	**96.0**	**80.0**	**68.0**	**69.87**
% LEP					
Attn. Rates					**92**
Schoolwide since	**1995-96**	**1991-92**	**1990-91**	**1995-96**	**1990-91**

Table 3: School Budget, State Section 31A At Risk, and Federal Title I Budget for Four Schools with Title I Schoolwide Projects, Detroit Public Schools, FY 1997-98.

School	School Budget	Section 31A At Risk	Federal Title I	Total Title I	Title I as % of Total Budget
Sinclair	$2,247,929	$212,120	$335,327	$547,447	24.35
Adams	$1,758,293	$129,674	$235,296	$364,970	20.76
Washington	$1,653,073	$164,039	$272,596	$436,635	26.41
Roosevelt	$1,864,470	$235,114	$529,953	$765,067	41.03

Source: Detroit Public Schools, Statement of Expenditures, Summarized by Funding Source, 12-31-97, Prepared by the Office of Financial Analysis, for each school.

Table 4: Per Pupil Funding: Total School Revenues, Federal Title I, and State Section 31A At Risk, Four Title I Schoolwide Projects, Detroit Public Schools, FY 1997-98.

School	Number of Students	Total Revenues	Section 31A At Risk	Federal Title I	Total Title I
Sinclair	781	2878.27	429.36	271.60	700.96
Adams	629	2795.38	206.16	374.08	580.24
Washington	564	2930.98	290.88	483.33	774.16
Roosevelt	728	2561.09	322.96	727.96	1050.92
District		6138.76			

Designing Title I Schoolwide Programs:
A Comparison of Three Urban Districts

Gail L. Sunderman
Johns Hopkins University

Prepared for presentation at the American Educational Research Association Annual Conference, Montreal, Canada, April 19-32, 1999. This research is sponsored in whole or in part by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) of the U.S. Department of Education (grant nos. R117D-40005 and RJ96006301). The content does not necessarily reflect the views of OERI or the Department of Education, or does mention or visual representation of trade names or commercial products constitute endorsement by any branch of the U.S. Government. Marian Amoa, James Choi, and Alexis Marotta provided research assistance.

Please address correspondence to: Gail L. Sunderman, Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, 3003 N. Charles Street, Baltimore, MD 21218; (410) 516-8825; gsunderman@csos.jhu.edu.

Designing Title I Schoolwide Programs: A Comparison of Three Urban Districts

Gail L. Sunderman
Johns Hopkins University

The 1994 *Improving America's Schools Act* (IASA) mandates that rigorous national standards be applied to all students, including those receiving Title I services. To meet the new policy challenge, states and districts were required to develop content and performance standards that are applied to all students. States are to develop or adopt annual assessments to use to determine the performance of students and hold schools accountable. The 1995 legislation also expanded the number of Title I schoolwide projects by lowering the eligibility threshold to include schools with 50 percent low-income students.

A primary objective of curriculum standards (standards-based reform) is the opportunity they provide for schools to develop consistent and uniform curriculum goals for all students (Wong & Sunderman, 1997; O'Day & Smith, 1993). The expectation is that this should improve the performance of all students, including Title I students. According to advocates of standards-based reform, curriculum frameworks are intended to provide direction and vision that will lead to an improvement in curriculum content and instruction (O'Day & Smith, 1993). The goal is a structure where curriculum and assessment are aligned and state and district policies support reform at the school level. The development of an accountability framework is seen as way to change student outcomes by changing what is taught and how it is taught. It assumes that relying on local decision makers to make decisions about curriculum has failed to improve student outcomes.

This paper examines how the federal accountability mandates affect the design and implementation of Title I schoolwide programs. It pays attention to the policies adopted by states and districts to meet the federal accountability mandates. At the school level, it examines how the implementation of an accountability framework affects the development of curriculum and instructional practices that allow teachers to work with students of different ability levels (Barr and Dreeben, 1983). Since Title I schoolwide funds are the main source of discretionary funds, it asks what organizational changes schools make to accommodate an emphasis on accountability.

This paper uses data from case studies of three states (Ohio, Illinois, and Michigan) and three districts (Cleveland, Chicago, and Detroit) to examine these questions.[1] In the first section we outline the theoretical perspective that guides this research. This is followed by a description of the study's research design. The next section presents the findings. This includes a discussion of the policies and strategies adopted by the three states and three districts in this study to improve academic performance and support schools in their efforts. It then looks at how schools accommodated the increased focus on standards. The concluding section of the paper discusses the implications of the findings on schooling for disadvantaged students and Title I schoolwide policy.

Theoretical Perspective

The institutional literature gives us insights into how to interpret the design and implementation of Title I schoolwide programs (March and Olsen, 1989; Powell and DiMaggio, 1991; Scott and Meyer, 1994). Using this broader, institutional framework

[1] All school names as well as the names of interviewees are pseudonyms.

establishes the context within which schools operate and takes into account the intergovernmental aspects of educational policy. Particularly important is to determine what takes place at each organizational level and how the activities at one level establish the conditions and outcomes at another level (Barr and Dreeben, 1983). For example, the 1988 Hawkins-Stafford Amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act gave local school districts and schools greater flexibility to decide where and how to use the federal Title I resources. This allowed schools to depart from a reliance on programs that pulled students out of their regular classroom for the delivery of services and adopt whole school designs.

Research on the implementation of Title I schoolwide projects and resource utilization suggest that schoolwide programs have made important gains in reducing curricular and instructional fragmentation. Surveys of Title I schoolwide projects reveal that the greater flexibility allowed schoolwide programs increased cooperation and coordination across categorical programs (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993) and reduced the fragmentation that accompanied categorical Title I programs (Wong, Hedges, Borman, & D'Agostino, 1996). Increased curricular integration and reduced instructional fragmentation, the use of assessments that informed teachers of individual student achievement, teachers' knowledge of student progress, and additional instruction on specific skills contributed to improving student learning (Sunderman and Mickelsen, 1998; Wong, Sunderman, and Lee, 1997; Millsap, Turnbull, Moss, Birgham, Gamse, & Marks, 1992; Millsap, Moss, & Gamse, 1993; Stringfield, Billig, & Davis, 1991). At the same, the broader institutional arrangements that schools operate in continue to influence the design and implementation of schoolwide programs. For example, in a comparative

case study of schoolwide programs in Minneapolis and Houston, district level policies were found to shape the design and implementation of schoolwide programs (Wong, Sunderman, & Lee, 1997). Other researchers found that the overall quality of the district was more important than programmatic components in determining the quality of Title I programs (Millsap, et al, 1992).

A key question for this study was the extent to which standards-based reforms affect the design and implementation of Title I schoolwide programs. Does the adoption of standards, curriculum frameworks, and assessment contribute to reducing curricula and instructional fragmentation for students in schoolwide programs? Recent studies on standards-based reforms have highlighted a variety of issues, including a focus on the design, implementation, and political issues involved in state accountability systems (Ladd, 1996; Jennings, 1998), and changes in teaching practice in the context of specific reforms (Spillane and Zeuli, 1999; Sunderman and Mickelsen, 1998). This research seeks to broaden that inquiry by examining the inclusion of schools with schoolwide programs into the broader systemic reform movement.

Research Design

Cleveland, Chicago, and Detroit were selected for inclusion in this study. The three sites represent urban school districts in the Midwest that have high concentrations of low-income students. To identify schools for participation in the study, a regression analysis was used that examined the relationship between measures of student achievement in reading and math and socio-economic characteristics.[2] Four inner city

[2] The socio-economic variables include percent of students who qualified for free or reduced price lunch, the stability of the student population over the academic year, the percent of students who were African

elementary schools in each district that showed differences in student outcomes were selected (see appendix for tables describing various background characteristics of each school). Two of the four schools in each district had student outcomes that were higher than expected, and two had outcomes that were lower than expected, when social and demographic characteristics of the schools were controlled. A comparative case study methodology was used to examine (1) how schools design and implement Title I schoolwide projects, (2) how state and district school reform policies affect the implementation of Title I schoolwide projects, and (3) how standards are implemented in schools with schoolwide programs. Site visits were made to each district during the 1997-98 and 1998-99 school years. School visits, staff interviews, and classroom observations were conducted in the four schools in each district and documentary material collected. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with principals, teachers, Title I coordinators, and teaching assistants to determine how policy changes affected the organization of Title I schoolwide projects. These interviews focused on resource allocation, school vision, content and performance standards, curriculum and instructional practices, professional support to teachers, and community involvement. Documentary materials included the school improvement plan, school budget, personnel allocation, Title I program and budget information, and corrective action plans. Interviews with district administrators gather information about district policies, particular regarding accountability and district Title I guidelines.

American, Latino, Asian or American Indian, the percent of students with limited English proficiency, the average daily attendance, the size of the school, and whether or not the school had a special program designation, such as magnet school. Achievement scores were collected for seven years, 1990 to 1996. See William L. Yancey and Raj Thadani, 1997, "Identifying Exceptional Schools: Chicago, Illinois," for more on the methodology and results of the analysis.

In addition, district administrators were interviewed and documentary materials collected from the central administration. These interviews focused on the history of the Title I schoolwide program, how resources are used to support the schools, and the kinds of support (curriculum, instructional, assessment, and professional development) provided to the schools. Particular attention was paid to how districts interpreted and implemented the federal and state accountability mandates. Documentary materials included Title I policy guidelines, district reform policies, demographic information, district budgets, and school level achievement test scores.

State Policy and District Support to Help Schools Meet the Standards

The federal IASI Title I legislation is non-prescriptive, describing only general expectations for schools with schoolwide programs. Nonetheless, both states and districts have adopted policies or strategies that comply with federal accountability mandates. All three states in this study have developed content and performance standards and implemented statewide assessments. To meet the state requirements, districts have developed accountability systems (frameworks) that include establishing content and performance standards, developing curriculum guides, and adopting other strategies to hold schools accountable.

To be sure, the IASA Title I legislation is not the only impetus for state and local policymakers to establish performance standards and curriculum frameworks. Since the publication of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983, the federal government has increasingly encouraged states to adopt standards and hold schools accountable for student performance. This direction has since been reinforced by both the Bush and Clinton

administrations. When President Bush met with the nation's governors at the 1989 education summit, a consensus emerged on six educational goals to be achieved by the year 2000.[3] Subsequently, President Bush launched the *America 2000* strategy to bring local communities voluntarily into a network to accomplish these goals. However, without funding, there was little incentive to ensure the goals were met. When President Clinton took office in 1993, he formalized these initiatives as *Goals 2000.* Under this legislation, states and school districts were encouraged to develop content and performance standards in exchange for federal school-reform grants.

These initiatives underscore two directions in federal educational policy since the 1980s. First, is the increasing nexus between the federal level of government and state governments. Increasingly, the federal government has defined an educational agenda and encouraged states to adopt and implement this agenda (Sunderman, 1995). To accomplish this agenda, the federal government has broadened its reliance on block grants, the delegation of authority to the state government, and deregulation of federal guidelines. Second, a consensus has emerged among policymakers that America's schools must perform better if students are to acquire the skills necessary to participate in the global economy (Mintrom and Vergari, 1997). It is believed that a primary way to accomplish this goal is to set high standards and hold schools accountable for performance.

The accountability policies adopted by the three states we visited—Ohio, Illinois, and Michigan—have implications for both district policy and schools with Title I

[3] These goals include: (1) all children in the U.S. will start school ready to learn; (2) the high school graduation rate will be at least 90 percent; (3) students in grades 4, 8, and 12 will demonstrate competency in the core subjects; (4) U.S. students will be first in the world in mathematics and science achievement; (5)

schoolwide programs. These policies have brought both schools and districts within the same system of accountability where disadvantaged students are held to the same expectations as their more advantaged peers. States have also moved in other directions by targeting persistently low achieving districts and passing legislation intended to change the governance arrangements of school districts. In this section we outline the state accountability and governance legislation and examine the strategies and policies the three districts adopted to facilitate the state goals.

Ohio: In August 1997, the Ohio General Assembly passed Senate Bill 55 that put in place a number of academic accountability initiatives.[4] This bill established a rating system that outlined minimum performance standards that each district must meet. These include minimum scores on the Ohio Proficiency Exam, a minimum student attendance rate (93%), and a maximum dropout rate (3%). The bill also established a high school exit exam and increased the credit hours required for graduation. To improve reading scores of elementary students, the bill contains a "fourth grade guarantee," that is, fourth grade students who fail to pass the reading portion of the Ohio Fourth-Grade Proficiency Test will be retained beginning in the 2001-02 school year. Retention was extended to include students who are truant and fail two or more subjects.

To comply with the state accountability law, the state board of education developed an Ohio proficiency manual that states what is to be taught for each subject at each grade level. The Cleveland Public Schools developed a Course of Study that is aligned with the Ohio proficiency manual.

---

every adult will be literate and able to compete in the work force; and (6) schools will be safe, disciplined, and drug-free.

[4] Ohio General Assembly, Am. Sub. Senate Bill 55, August 1997.

In July 1997, the state legislature passed a bill (H.B. 269) that gave control of the Cleveland public schools to the mayor.[5] Modeled on similar legislation enacted in Illinois in 1995, the legislation gives the mayor the authority to appoint a nine-member school board and select a chief executive officer (CEO) to run the schools. The mayor appoints the nine board members from a list of 18 candidates nominated by a panel of parents, educators, and business leaders. The CEO, with board approval, has the authority to take corrective action in low performing schools. The plan was supported by Cleveland Tomorrow, a group representing the city's largest 50 corporations, and by the Greater Cleveland Growth Association, representing 5,000 area businesses. Republican lawmakers introduced the legislation.

The district has interpreted the state legislation (H.B. 269 and S.B. 55) and federal Title I legislation in a number of ways. First, there is a focus on improving academic achievement. According to one district administrator, "Improved student performance on the Ohio proficiency, of course, is the real bottom line."[6] Second, there is limited support for school autonomy where the district supports the development of a school-based academic achievement plan. Third, there is the goal of insuring that schools use their Title I money as one resource to support the overall mission of the school and that compensatory education is aligned with the major curricular areas in a school. "Title I programs in our schools are part of a larger, comprehensive plan to improve academic achievement."[7] These latter two objectives incorporate the schoolwide concept embedded in the federal legislation.

---

[5] Ohio General Assembly, Substitute House Bill Number 269, July 1997.
[6] District Office Administrator 1, Cleveland City Schools, Interview February 12, 1999.
[7] District Office Administrator 1, Cleveland City Schools, Interview February 12, 1999.

When we conducted our interviews (February 1999), the new CEO, appointed by the mayor under provisions of H.B. 269, had been on the job for just 11 weeks. These objectives were in place and articulated by the administrators we spoke with at that time. We believe they will remain priorities because of the constraints imposed by both the federal IASA and state legislation. At the very least, district administrators were cognizant of the focus on accountability: "The federal legislation, especially with the last reorganization, has really set in motion the whole focus on school improvement and a school's academic achievement."[8]

The primary mechanism in place to accomplish these objectives is the Academic Achievement Plan (AAP). Each school has a core team consisting of the principal, teachers, corporate partners, and parent and community representatives that are responsible for developing the AAP. The plan specifies an academic direction for the school, a mission statement, and the allocation of resources to support the plan. Title I resources are incorporated into that plan as an additional support to help schools achieve the goals they identified. The state supported this direction by consolidating the planning process to include one plan for academic achievement and Title I.

As part of the district's accountability system, schools are given responsibility for their daily operations, and are held accountable for student outcomes.[9] Two performance measures have been identified: improving student achievement as measured on the Ohio Proficiency tests and improving student attendance at school.[10] School improvement "targets" are identified for each school that take into account the past performance of the

[8] District Office Administrator 1, Funded Programs, Cleveland City Schools, Interview February 12, 1999.
[9] Cleveland City Public Schools, *Accountability in the Cleveland Public Schools: Overview of the District's Accountability System, Performance Targets for the 1997/98 School Year.* October 22, 1997.

school's population. For example, Lincoln, where 16.2 percent of the 4th grade cohort passed the 4th grade Ohio proficiency in 1996-97, had a target of 21.2 percent passing in 1997-98.[11] The attendance rate in 1996-97 was 91.0 percent; the target for 1997-98 was 91.7 percent. A third objective, improving the organizational efficiency and school climate, is measured through a school survey.

With the Ohio Proficiency test, many of the schools are focusing on proficiency literacy skills. To help schools meet these skills, the district adopted a new reading series that is more closely aligned with the state standards. The district is also providing a reading resource teacher to the schools for the primary grades (K-2). In January 1999, the new CEO introduced "warm up" activities in all the elementary schools (grades three through eight). These are exercises in the core curriculum areas for students to do for ten minutes at the start of each school day. They are intended to assist students in preparing for the Ohio Proficiency Test.

The district also administers two assessments in addition to the Ohio Proficiency test. One is the off-grade proficiency, administered in grades one through three. This tests students on the same areas as the Ohio proficiency and is intended to help schools track student progress. Students who are not doing well can be identified early, before they reach the fourth grade. The other test is an interim test for students in grades three

---

[10] Cleveland City Public Schools, *Accountability in the Cleveland Public Schools: Overview of the District's Accountability System, Performance Targets for the 1997/98 School Year.* October 22, 1997.

[11] Using a regression analysis, the district determined a predicted level of performance on the proficiency test based on students' performance on CAT reading tests, the schools' mobility rate, and poverty index. The predicted level of performance was then compared to the observed level of performance, and a target was established for the following year. Schools which performed at much higher than predicted rates were given lower improvement targets, and schools with much lower than expected performance were given higher improvement targets. Schools are evaluated only on those students who have been in the school from early October through the spring testing week. For more information, see, Cleveland City Public Schools, *Accountability in the Cleveland Public Schools: Overview of the District's Accountability System, Performance Targets for the 1997/98 School Year.* October 22, 1997.

through eight in reading and math. The data from this test are available within two weeks of the testing, "so two weeks after taking the test every classroom teacher knows what their youngsters did and knows their area of weakness."[12] The goal is to insure that students are performing at grade level. Commenting on the district testing policy, one administrator said:

"If you have this kind of data for every kid in your class who was present and took the test, nobody should fall through the cracks. No one should. If you had this kind of data at grades one, two, and three and you know the high stakes test is grade four, then you begin to use this data to provide support and to focus everyone on what it is you have to do. You miss not a single youngster."[13]

Illinois: To comply with Illinois Public Law 88-686, passed in August 1996, the Chicago Public Schools developed the Chicago Academic Standards (CAS) and Curriculum Framework Statements (CFS).[14] These define "what students should know and be able to do"[15] in four core curriculum areas--Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies. These local learning objectives must meet or exceed the goals established by the State Board of Education.[16] The Chicago standards and curriculum frameworks are "designed for all students, including special needs students and those with limited English proficiency."[17] They leave it up to the schools and individual teachers to adjust and adapt the instructional materials to meet the needs of the students being served. CPS identified grades 3, 6, 8, 10, and 12 as the benchmark grades for reporting progress to the public. Schools began implementing the current standards during the 1996-97 school year. Schools are assessed on the Illinois Goals Assessment

---

[11] District Office Administrator 2, Cleveland City Schools, February 12, 1999.
[13] District Office Administrator 2, Cleveland City Schools, February 12, 1999.
[14] Chicago School Reform Board of Trustees. (1997). *Expecting More: Higher Standards for Chicago's Students. Chicago Academic Standards and Frameworks.* Chicago: The Board of Education of the City of Chicago.
[15] Ibid.
[16] *The School Code of Illinois* (1996). Chapter 105, Article 2-3.63.

Program (IGAP), a state administered test, and the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS).[18] The central office administration is currently developing a district assessment that is aligned with the standards.

In Chicago, there are predictable consequences for poor performance. Schools are placed on a statewide Academic Watch list for not performing well on the IGAP, and schools are subject to academic probation or reconstitution by the district for poor performance on the ITBS.[19] Students are retained in grades 3, 6, 8 and 10 if they do not meet grade level proficiency on standardized tests.

To help low performing schools (that is, schools placed on probation), the district put in place a structure designed to support school improvement. This includes a School Operations Manager to assist the principal with the school's fiscal operations and a Probation Manager to oversee the school improvement process. In addition, schools on probation are required to work with an external partner chosen by the school and contracted to provide educational services to assist with the school improvement process. Instrumental to meeting the demands of the district's accountability process is Title I money. It is the primary resource available to schools on probation to pay the costs of the external partner.[20] In addition, using state Chapter 1 funds allocated to the central office, the district supports an after school program in all schools and summer school for

---

[17] Chicago School Reform Board of Trustees. (1997).

[18] Beginning in the spring of 1999, the state introduced a new state test, the Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT) that will replace the IGAP.

[19] Elementary schools can be placed on "probation" when fewer than 15 percent of their students score above the national norms on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS). Schools are eligible for "reconstitution" if they do not improve after being on probation. Beginning in 1999, the district added a process called "reengineering." This is a step between probation and reconstitution adopted to help schools that are not improving on probation, but intended to avoid the extreme measure of reconstitution. When a school is reconstituted, the central office appoints a principal and all staff must re-apply for their positions.

[20] The Office of Accountability pays the costs of the external partnership during the first year of probation or reconstitution. During the second year, the cost is split evenly between the schools and the Office of Accountability, while the third year is paid entirely by the schools.

students in the benchmark grades that did not meet the district's promotion requirements.[21]

The district is also encouraging schools on probation to use their Title I money to support a focused approach to reading improvement. According to one district administrator, "we still find that too often schools use their discretionary funds, Title I funds, for a variety of different things. We are trying to get our elementary schools to understand that if reading is your concern, then you need to make a conscientious effort to focus on reading instruction."[22] To facilitate this goal, schools on probation are required to develop a reading improvement plan in addition to the school improvement plan. The idea behind the reading improvement plan is to have schools realign both their general and discretionary (Title I) funds to support a reading program. Since the plan is school-based, discretionary funds are the primary resource available to support the implementation of the reading plan.

Schools not on probation have greater flexibility in how they use their Title I funds and design their programs than those schools on probation. The probationary designation, which extends the authority of the central office to take corrective action in a school, places limits on school discretion. In those schools not on probation, school-based decision making guides the design and implementation of the schoolwide program, with central office services available upon request. Nonetheless, schools are still subject to review by the Office of Accountability and the constraints imposed by the district-wide emphasis on improving standardized test scores.

---

[21] The 1988 School Reform Act disbursed state Chapter 1 funds directly to the schools. Under the 1995 Amendatory Act, a portion of those funds was disbursed to the central administration.
[22] District Office Administrator, Chicago Public Schools, February 22,1999.

Michigan: The basic framework for improving student achievement was put in place by the state legislature in 1990 with the passage of Public Act 25. This law includes four components: 1) the development of a district and school improvement plan; 2) a core curriculum in every district; 3) an annual educational report to the public for every school; and 4) a school accreditation process which takes into account student achievement on the state assessments.[23] To meet the requirements of this act, the state developed core curriculum content standards and linked the Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP) to those standards. In 1993, P.A. 25 was amended to require districts to offer the State Board of Education's core academic curriculum by the 1997-98 school year. Beginning in the spring of 1996, the state began administering the High School Proficiency Test to high school juniors.[24] Until recently, the state could do little if a district failed to meet the performance standards. Sanctions existed for poor-performing schools, and included replacing the building administrator, provisions for parents to choose any accredited school within the district, and state take-over and closure.

The Detroit Public Schools developed a district curriculum framework in 1987 (called Strands and Objectives). This has since been modified to meet the state standards and objectives. In addition, the district adopted exit skills for grades K-5, beginning in 1998. These are aligned with the state performance standards and outline what a student should know at each grade level. Students who have not mastered the exit skills by the end of the school year can be retained. The board funds a summer exit skills academy

---

[23] Act No. 25, March 13, 1990, State of Michigan 85th Legislature, Regular Session of 1990.

[24] This test encountered stiff opposition from parents in 1997 in response to poor test results on the 1996 exam. Parents protested the administration of the test by taking advantage of an exemption intended to allow parents of developmentally disadvantage children a chance to decide whether or not they would take

that is mandatory for students not passing the exit skills. The district first introduced the exit skills in the primary grades (K-3), and has since expanded them through the fifth grade.

A recent focus of reform of the Detroit Public Schools has been on changing the formal institutional arrangements that govern the public schools. Like many big city school districts, the Detroit Public Schools have been under intense scrutiny by state lawmakers to improve academic achievement. Under pressure from the state, the district undertook a number of steps to reform. In September 1997, the board adopted a re-organizational plan that included eliminating the six area offices. This was intended to streamline the central administration and save money. As part of the re-organization, the board voted to eliminate 15 out of 45 administrative positions, including five area superintendents, in April 1998. In November 1997, the board ousted then Superintendent David Sneed and replaced him with Eddie Green, a long time Detroit school administrator.

Governance reform also includes attempts to pass legislation that would give the state the authority to take over the district. Governor Engler first introduced legislation that would give the state authority to take over low performing school districts in 1997. The proposed legislation would allow the state to take over the administration of a school district if more than 80 percent of its students failed the state proficiency test or if its dropout rate exceeded 25 percent. The plan failed to pass the legislature where the Democrats held a majority in the House and some Republicans opposed the plan in deference to maintaining local control.

---

the exam. In one affluent suburban district (the Birmingham school district), over half of the juniors were excused from taking the test under this exemption.

In January 1999, Governor Engler again proposed legislation that would allow a state takeover of a district school system. This time the legislation included only the Detroit district. This legislation, modeled on similar reform plans in Chicago, Baltimore, and Cleveland, puts the mayor in charge of the schools. Under the plan, the mayor has the authority to appoint a seven-member reform board. One member of the board includes the state Superintendent of Schools Arthur Ellis. It requires that a majority of the other members are Detroit residents. The new board in turn appoints a chief executive officer to head the schools. The bill contains provisions to retain the elected 11-member Detroit Board of Education in a non-binding advisory role to quell protests over the elimination of an elected board. The bill passed the Republican dominated legislature in March 1999 and was quickly signed into law by the governor.[25] Following passage of the legislation, the mayor appointed current superintendent, Eddie Green, as acting CEO.

This focus on governance change has fostered a sense of discontinuity in district leadership and contributed to fragmentation in district policy. It is not unusual for each change in administration to be accompanied by programmatic changes. For example, a cluster organization within the district was replaced with constellations following a recent re-organization. For one school we visited, this reorganization put the middle school that the elementary students go to in a different constellation. Frequent leadership change has reinforced a focus on the protection of turf by mid level administrators. Until they were eliminated, the area offices retained considerable authority over the schools in their area and the staffs in their office. To maintain control, there is a reliance on hierarchical

[25] The House approved the bill, 66-43, and the Senate approved the House version of the bill, 31-7. Darci McConnell and Chris Christoff, "School reform now needs names: Archer wants public to help choose

decision making, with many decisions, even minor ones, made by the superintendent. At the school level, much of the organizational change that accompanies the governance reform of the Detroit central office is decoupled from the day to day operations of the school. This is in part because site based management gave schools authority over program decisions at the school level.

Organizational Change at the School Level

In this section we looked for organizational changes at the school level associated with the adoption of accountability mandates. Three resources—the assignment of students to classes and teachers to classrooms, and the allocation of time to instruction—were identified as organizational responses taken by school administrators. These decisions are important because they are likely to impact instruction within the classroom. It is important to point out that the federal, state, and district accountability mandates created conditions that school administrators felt compelled to respond to. Title I resources often played a significant role in these changes since they are the major source of discretionary funds available to school administrators. We present our findings by district, while noting that the similarities between districts outweigh the differences. Our findings indicate that low performing schools were more likely to reassign teachers and regroup students to reduce class size while high performing schools were more likely to re-allocate time to increase instructional time. Only one school changed their curriculum to accommodate the standards. That school, a dual English-Spanish language immersion school, altered the emphasis to increase English language development.

---

board." *Detroit Free Press*, March 26, 1999.

Cleveland City Schools:

There are uneven sanctions in Cleveland for poor performance on the Ohio Proficiency test. Principals could be reassigned or lose their job if their school did not perform well, and test scores are publicly reported. The state's fourth grade guarantee does not take effect until the year 2002. Nonetheless, there was tremendous pressure on schools to improve. Three schools we visited—Carter, Sherman, and McKinley—did not perform well on the fourth grade Ohio Proficiency Exam. Sherman, a school we identified as a positive outlier school, saw a decline in the fourth grade proficiency test scores from 1996-97 and 1997-98 (see table 1). McKinley and Carter were both negative outlier schools in our analysis (see appendix). McKinley saw some improvement from 1996-97 to 1997-98 while Carter's test scores declined. Only Lincoln consistently performed well. In this section we contrast the organizational changes made in the Title I schoolwide program in three schools, Carter, Sherman, and Lincoln.

Table 1: Fourth grade Ohio Proficiency Examination passing rates, McKinley, Carter, Sherman, and Lincoln Elementary Schools, Cleveland City Schools, 1996-97 and 1997-98.

School	96-97 pass rate	97-98 pass rate	Target	Obs. Improve.
McKinley	0.0%	4.3%	5.0%	4.3%
Carter	5.3%	2.1%	8.3%	-3.2%
Sherman	10.8%	3.3%	15.8%	-7.5%
Lincoln	16.2%	37.5%	21.2%	21.3%
District-Elem.	14.1%	17.3%	19.1%	3.2%

Source: Cleveland City Schools, "Final Accountability Evaluation Report."

Carter Elementary is one of ten schools in Cleveland identified as a "lower quartile" school. This means they are performing well below expectations, particularly in reading, on the Ohio Proficiency test. Under pressure to improve test scores, the school

revised its AAP plan. As part of this revision, the school "wanted to include as a vital part of the plan the way we're using our Title I funds and our Title I teachers."[26] A primary focus of the revised AAP plan was to reduce class size and increase the number of teachers in each classroom.

Carter moved the Title I teachers into self-contained classrooms, especially at the fourth grade level, to reduce class size. This helped reduce class size in the fourth grade to eighteen students, compared to an average class size of 27 for the school. To accommodate the smaller class size, small group tutoring was eliminated. Commenting on the change, a former Title I teacher said: "It's much harder when you are dealing with eighteen to keep them focused because of the issues that they're bringing with them. So I feel that the Title I program has been watered down."[27] In other words, the benefit of working with small groups of low performing students had been lost.

In addition to using Title I resources, the school used other resources to reduce class size or increase the number of teachers or teaching assistants in each classroom. The principal used the substitute budget to bring in additional teachers, recruited retired senior volunteers to work with students in pull out groups or one-on-one, and reassigned special subject teachers (such as music) to work with students on reading in the weeks before the proficiency exam. The school converted storage rooms into "reading centers' where tutors or volunteers could work individually with students. The aim of this approach was to reduce group size as much as possible because "the greatest need is one-on-one help. They really need small, very small group interventions."[28]

---

[26] Principal interview, Carter Elementary, Cleveland City Schools, February 10, 1999.
[27] Fourth grade teacher interview, Carol Vobornik, Carter Elementary School, Cleveland City Schools, February 10, 1999.
[28] Principal interview, Carter Elementary, Cleveland City Schools, February 10, 1999.

Another strategy Carter used was to target particular grades and subjects where test scores are low. For example, one Title I teacher was working with fourth grade students on science to help them prepare for the proficiency exam. Students are tested on a practice proficiency exam to determine which outcomes they are weak in. The teacher then pulls students out to review and teach the science proficiency outcomes. Students are selected based on low scores on a particular outcome, and not necessarily because they are a low performing student. This change meant that the teaching of science reverted back to the regular classroom teacher. The school also assigned a Title I teacher to the third grade to work on reading since third grade reading scores were very low. This teacher either works in classroom with the classroom teacher or pulls students out for small group tutoring.

Sherman also regrouped students and teachers to take advantage of the reading resource teacher provided by the district. The reading resource teachers work with students "in the middle group that normally would fall through the cracks, so to speak,"[29] and Title I teachers address the needs of students in the bottom 36 percentile. The goal is to provide extra help to the students above the 36th percentile, but below the district proficiency requirements, to help them get to grade level and pass the proficiency test.

Lincoln reported the second highest proficiency test scores in the district on the 1998 Ohio proficiency exam. Only one school, with a passing rate of 41.7 percent, performed better than Lincoln.[30] The district policy that schools incorporate Title I as part of the AAP plan "helped us combine all of our efforts into one specific target or a few targets. So the main goal is to improve proficiency scores in the fourth grade. And

[29] Principal interview, Sherman Elementary, Cleveland City Schools, February 8, 1999.
[30] Data from the Cleveland City Schools, "Final Accountability Evaluation Report."

attendance rates—for those to increase as well."[31] Nonetheless, the school made few changes in the Title I program to accommodate the testing. Instead, the emphasis on testing increased a focus on academic subjects. Many special programs were eliminated to provide additional time for instruction, music, art, and P.E. classes were often used for instruction, and teachers devoted more time to teaching the learning outcomes from the proficiency test. The cut in the school's Title I allocation made the most significant impact on the program, resulting in five rather than seven Title I teachers.

Lincoln has continued to focus the Title I program on children having difficulty with reading. They have one Title I teacher that works with fourth grade students on reading and language arts and another that works with second grade students on reading and language arts. The teacher working with the second grade students evaluates the students at the beginning of the year "even if it's an informal oral evaluation to see where these children are."[32] She provides instruction to small groups of students or individuals, depending on their needs. She may be in a classroom forty or eighty minutes depending on the daily schedule. The school is experimenting with reducing class size in first grade. According to the principal, "It's the first grade level that is the hardest. It's the level that most children will repeat. . . So we thought, well, let's try to have an extra teacher instead and see if that makes a difference."

The computer program is also intended to reinforce the classroom curriculum by providing additional instruction to all students in the school. For example, when the science teacher introduced primates in the science lab, she asked the computer teacher to extend the lesson in the computer lab. As the date of the proficiency exam approached,

---

[31] Principal interview, Lincoln Elementary, Cleveland City Schools, February 9, 1999.
[32] Title I teacher interview, Lincoln Elementary, Cleveland City Schools, February 9, 1999.

teachers asked the computer teacher to reinforce writing in the lab. The computer lab was added at the beginning of the 1998-99 school year. The school had three computers in each classroom that they purchased using Ohio SchoolNet funds. However, they found that was not enough for effective instruction, and obtained a grant to purchase additional computers to establish a computer lab.

Chicago Public Schools:

Two of the schools we visited in Chicago—Fairfax and Cornell—had new principals beginning in November 1998 (see appendix for background characteristics of the four Chicago schools). In both cases, the principal inherited the Title I plan put in place by the previous principal or interim principal, as was the case at Fairfax. Fairfax, a school we identified as a positive outlier, continued many of the programs already in place. Cornell, a negative outlier school, was facing a teacher shortage. At the same time, the Title I program supported a large number of school assistants. The program lacked a coherent focus, which may account for why many teachers in the school could not identify how the Title I program operated. Cornell and Butler, another school we identified as a negative outlier, were both on probation. The fourth school, Montgomery (a positive outlier), also continued many of the Title I schoolwide programs already in place. A central component of the school's curricula program is the Success for All program (SFA), adopted in 1994.

The schools we visited in Chicago were under considerable pressure to improve test scores under the district's accountability policies. Table 2 presents the percent of students in each school scoring at or above national norms on the ITBS, the measure the district uses to track school progress. As already noted, there were predictable

consequences for both students and schools for poor performance. To understand the organizational changes schools made to accommodate the accountability mandates, we examined how schools responded to the district's retention policy. This policy seemed to have the greatest impact, at the school level, on how schools allocated Title I resources, particularly in low performing schools.

Table 2: Percentage of Students Scoring At or Above National Norms on the ITBS, Reading Comprehension and Math, Four Schools with Title I Schoolwide Projects, Chicago Public Schools, 1990-1998.

	Fairfax		Cornell		Montgomery		Butler		District Ave., grades 3-8	
Year	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math	Read	Math
1990	12.5	27.1	12.2	11.8	13.3	23.3	12.8	9.6	23.5	27.1
1991	12.8	28.5	12.8	13.9	13.4	24.4	10.5	11.6	21.8	26.6
1992	14.4	34.7	10.1	13.9	17.1	25.2	11.0	13.1	22.4	26.3
1993	21.1	28.9	12.4	15.0	32.0	33.1	12.8	9.9	26.8	30.1
1994	14.5	24.6	11.6	19.2	26.6	31.7	11.7	5.9	26.5	28.0
1995	15.4	27.7	10.9	17.2	32.5	34.5	10.2	8.1	26.5	29.8
1996	21.2	27.8	13.1	19.4	28.0	29.3	12.8	8.8	29.1	31.0
1997	25.5	33.3	12.9	21.3	22.3	25.1	11.7	17.1	30.3	35.9
1998	22.5	43.6	17.3	24.2	37.4	34.5	13.5	22.7	28.6	31.1

Source: Chicago Public Schools, Office of Accountability, Department of Research, Assessment, & Quality Reviews, *School Information Database*, http://acct.multi1.cps.k-12.us/

The district's retention policy poses two challenges for schools. First, unless teachers are provided alternative materials, retained students are likely to repeat the same curriculum they received the year previous to retention. Second, retaining students is likely to create an imbalance in the number of students between grades. The effects of

Table 3: Number of Classes and Student Enrollment by Grade for Chicago Public Schools, Grades One through Eight, FY 1999.

School	1st Grade		2nd Grade		3rd Grade		4th Grade		5th Grade		6th Grade		7th Grade		8th Grade	
	# Class	# Students	# Class	# Students	# Class	# Students	# Class	# Students	# Class	# Students	# Class	# Students	# Class	# Students	# Class	# Students
Fairfax	3	66	3	52	4	81	1	32	2	39	2	37	3	43	2	22
Montgmy	5	149	7	175	5	139	4	141	4	133	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cornell	3	77	3	64	5	94	2	59	2	39	2[33]	66			2	62
Butler	4[34]	57	2	56	3	66	1	22	1	31	2[35]	26	1[36]	21	1	32

[33] Both of these classes are 6-7 splits.
[34] One of these classes is a 1-2 split.
[35] One of these classes is a 6-7 split.
[36] This class is a 7-8 split.

retention are particularly evident in the third grade at Fairfax, Cornell, and Butler (see table 3). All three schools have between 37 percent to 66 percent more students in the third grade than in the fourth grade.[37] To address these challenges, the schools implemented a transition program for students retained in the third and sixth grades.[38] This program is designed to reduce class size in the benchmark grades, and provide an alternative curriculum. Title I funds often support the additional teachers.

Fairfax is one example where the school has added transition classes in the third grade to help lower class size. Two of the five third grade classes at Fairfax are transition classes. Each transition class has fifteen students. In Ms. Hansen's class, the students have been retained once or twice. In Ms. Taylor's class, there are seven students who are in the third grade for the first time, many who need extra help, and eight who have been retained. The remainder of the retained third-grade students were placed in regular third grade classes. The board provided curriculum materials for the transition class so students are not simply repeating the same curriculum they had before retention.[39] Teachers in regular classroom also received the board materials for use with the retained students.

Another strategy schools used to accommodate the retained students included assigning students to split grades. Both Cornell and Butler have 6^{th} - 7^{th} grade split classes, and Butler has a 7^{th} – 8^{th} grade split (see table 3). The district re-tests retained students in January, and if they do well, they are promoted, mid-year, to the next grade.

---

[37] There are 60 percent more students in 3^{rd} than 4^{th} grade at Fairfax, 37 percent more at Cornell, and 66 percent more at Butler.

[38] The district also mandates summer school for retained students. In addition, the district has a transition high school for retained 8^{th} grade students who reach the age of 15.

[39] The first year we visited these schools, 1997, retained students were simply repeating the same curriculum they had the previous year. The introduction of the transition classes represents recognition by the district of this practice.

This also means re-grouping students within the school. For example, six of Ms. Taylor's third grade students were promoted mid-year to the fourth grade. Five retained third graders where then moved from regular third grade classrooms into the transition class.

In response to the district retention policy, Montgomery decided to also fail 4th and 5th grade students who were more than one year below grade level. There was an equity rationale to this decision. According to the principal, this policy was intended to reduce the pressure on 3rd graders as well as increase the pressure on 4th and 5th graders to continue to work hard. It is also likely that retaining students at other grade levels will help to even out the distribution of students across grades. Montgomery uses Title I resources to reduce class size in all classes as well as reduce the number of students in reading groups. The school assigns retired teacher volunteers to the third grade to help tutor students needing extra help.

In Chicago, schools not on probation are under less pressure to allocate Title I funds to increase test scores at the benchmark grades. Montgomery has continued programs that provide additional instruction for students that are below grade level as well as develop an enrichment program for students at or above grade level. The principal commented, "we tend to forget about our students who are on level or above so we decided this year to use it (i.e., the computer lab) as an enrichment program for those students. . . They can go in there and do projects on anything they like, be it writing, or projects in science or they can just work on an individual basis where they are just competing with no one but themselves."[40] Students needing additional help receive instruction in the after school program (supported by the district) or through small group

tutoring. The school also has "walking reading," implemented as part of the Success for All program. Students spend 90 minutes a day in reading groups at their level. To support the reading program, the school uses Title I resources to hire tutors and reading teachers to insure the reading groups are smaller than the regular classroom. The school also supports the emphasis on reading and writing by allocating a portion of Title I money to purchase reading materials, a computer writing program, and to update classroom libraries. After a two year decline in reading and math scores (see table 2), the district notified the school that if scores continued to fall, they would be eligible for probation. This promoted the school to re-evaluate their instructional program and make modifications to insure test score improvement

The school also has a focus on professional development. The principal requires teachers to attend at least two conferences or workshops a year. Using money from a state grant, the school put extra money towards substitute teachers to allow more teachers time off to attend workshops. To prepare for the test, the school adopted a six-day reading week with five days are devoted to reading, vocabulary, and language arts, and the sixth day to test preparation.

Detroit Public Schools:

The four schools we visited in Detroit are Adams, Roosevelt, Washington, and Sinclair. Using 1996 Metropolitan Achievement Test scores, Washington and Sinclair were identified as positive outlier schools, and Adams and Roosevelt as negative outlier schools (see appendix). Adams has a dual language immersion program in English and Spanish. The school started in the fall of 1992 with a literacy program for 0-3 year olds,

[40] Principal interview, Montgomery Elementary, Chicago Public Schools, December 14, 1998.

a pre-Kindergarten for 4 year olds, kindergarten, and first grade. Each year a grade level was added, with a seventh grade added in the fall of 1998. Students may enter the program at any grade level if their literacy skills in Spanish and English are on or above grade level, and entering students are tested on their literacy skills. The other three schools are pre-kindergarten to fifth grade. All four schools are empowered schools, that is, they practice site-based management and shared decision making. About twenty percent of Roosevelt's students are Hmong, while Washington and Sinclair are predominately African American. Washington has been recognized by the state for their Title I program. Sinclair, which has had its own set of exit skills for many years, was a model for the district's exit skills. According to one teacher, ". . .really our exit skills are Detroit's exit skills."[41]

The schools we visited in Detroit made few schoolwide organizational changes in their Title I program to accommodate the accountability mandates. For the most part, the four schools continued the program that was in place. This included strategies that provided additional instruction to the lowest performing students. All four schools had after school programs and a summer school program that is mandatory for students not meeting the exit skills requirements. They continued pullout and push-in programs to provide instruction to students needing extra help. This often included additional instruction to help students prepare for the MEAP exam. Finally, Title I instruction focused on meeting the academic needs of individual students.

Roosevelt is one example of how a school in Detroit used their Title I funds. The Title I program is organized to provide additional instructional time to students in the school. The school has a Title I teacher with expertise in reading that runs an accelerated

[41] Title I Coordinator, Sinclair Academy, Detroit Public Schools, January 20, 1999.

reading program for all students in the school. Using a computer program, students are tested on reading comprehension to determine their grade level. They take books out to read that on at their reading level and take a computerized test on the book when they finish. The goal is to measure individual progress in reading. The Title I teacher and two teaching assistants provide small group tutoring in reading to students needing extra help. In addition, the school has an extended day program that stresses basic reading skills and helps upper grade students with MEAP preparation. To help with math skills, there is a math teacher that works in the classroom with the upper grades.

According to the principal, the district's core curriculum and MEAP test has helped to focus the instructional program on particular skills and the sequencing of instruction. "You want to make sure the child has a fair chance of doing well, so you want to make sure the child has been taught the skills that will be tested."[42] Several teachers credited the exit skills with keeping them on target. A third grade teacher, commenting on how the exit skills changed her teaching, said: "You can't do anything but be on target if you are following the exit skills. I mean, this is telling you exactly what to do. To me, it's even better than using your curriculum guide because what they have done is taken the curriculum and broken it down into specific skills that they want the kids to have. I stay on target and I'm finding extra supplemental materials to focus right on what they're supposed to know."[43]

Roosevelt is facing constraints of another sort. Because of constant growth over the past few years, the school is short of classrooms. The school had to cancel their extended day kindergarten program because of lack of space. To help prepare for the

[42] Principal interview, Roosevelt Elementary, Detroit Public Schools, March 5, 1999.
[43] Third grade teacher interview, Roosevelt Elementary, Detroit Public Schools, March 6, 1999.

MEAP, the school moved social studies out of homeroom and made it a special class. This also was eliminated because of lack of space and moved back into the homeroom.

A different strategy was adopted by Adams, which altered the focus of their dual language program in response to the MEAP testing. For several years, beginning in the primary grades (K-2), reading was taught in Spanish, and up to 90 percent of instruction in the content areas was conducted in Spanish. Formal reading in English was introduced in the third grade. Academic instruction in English was then gradually increased each year until it reached 50 percent in English and 50 percent in Spanish by the fifth grade. Since both the MEAP test and the exit skills place an emphasis on English language skills, the school felt at a disadvantage, even when their test scores on a Spanish language test were satisfactory. The fourth grade reading scores on the 1996-97 MEAP indicated that a smaller percentage of students scored in the satisfactory category in 1996-97 than in 1995-96.[44] To accommodate MEAP testing the school has altered its dual language program by reducing the focus on Spanish and introducing English reading earlier. In the first grade, students are now taught in their native language, and English speakers learn oral Spanish as a second language and Spanish speakers learn oral English as a second language. Pre-kindergartens are introduced to pre-reading skills in English. At the fourth grade level, students practice the skills tested on the MEAP in English.

Conclusions and Implications

The assumption behind the adoption of standards, curriculum frameworks, and assessments is that they will alter teaching practice and improve learning. In this paper

[44] Susan C. Barfield (1997). *Summative Evaluation of the Two-Way Immersion Program at [Adams], 1994-97.* Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

we examined the kinds of decisions made at various levels of the school system (state, district, and school) to incorporate the federal legislative expectations. At all three levels, there was a reliance on structural (organizational changes) or outcome controls to create pressure and place constraints on schools. The three states and districts examined in this study incorporated the federal legislative expectations into their accountability systems by adopting performance and content standards, core curriculum frameworks, and assessment systems. All three districts are providing additional test score information to teachers to help them monitor student progress. This may help teachers identify students who are not doing well on standardized tests, but it also assumes that teaching the content that will be covered on the test will benefit students educationally.

Schools were most likely to rely on organizational changes, particularly reducing class size, to accommodate the accountability mandates. In schools under less pressure to improve test scores, administrators were less likely to reduce class size and instead added opportunities for students to receive additional instruction on the same curriculum that they received in the classroom. It is unclear whether reducing class size is a promising strategy to improve test scores. Decisions about class size must be taken into account, along with the distribution of student aptitude within a class, when teachers organize students for instruction. Thus, the teacher's observation that the reduced class size made instruction more difficult makes sense because it changes how teachers group students for instruction.

Further, Title I schoolwide resources provide an important resource for both schools and districts. Chicago requires schools on probation to use their Title I funds to support school improvement, and Cleveland requires Title I planning to be part of the

overall school planning process. Because of the flexibility built into the schoolwide program, Title I resources offered an important mechanism at the school level to link the standards-based reforms to schooling practices.

The schools in Detroit were less likely to make the same organizational changes we observed in Chicago or Cleveland. For the most part, they continued the Title I schoolwide programs already in place. This may be because the standards movement lacked sufficient support within a district consumed by management changes. It is also likely to reflect the variety of approaches the state has adopted to school reform, moving from finance reform in the mid-1980s, to a standards-based accountability framework in the early 1990s, to governance reform by 1999. Adopting many different policies can contribute to fragmentation by creating competing goals and organizational structures.

The focus on standards-based reform has led to a more integrated approach to curriculum and assessment in at least two states, Ohio and Illinois. Different institutional levels, the state and district, have developed mechanisms designed to further the goals of standards-based accountability. Moreover, by including schoolwide programs within the same accountability framework, Title I services are expected to align with the state and district performance standards.

Notwithstanding the increased integration at the state and district level, a number of questions remain about standards-based reform. First, does standards-based reform lead to the kind of changes in instructional practices desired? Clearly, when teachers teach to the test, there is a clear correlation between what is taught and what is tested. But, equally important is instructional pacing and appropriate level of instruction. Teachers must be able to accommodate instruction to the needs of students with differing

levels of ability and learning rates. Second, does standards-based reform lead to the kind of grouping arrangements that facilitate student learning? This research showed that changes in how students are grouped is a frequent response of school administrators to the constraints imposed by the current accountability systems. The challenge is to help teachers develop grouping arrangements that can be instructionally effective. Finally, are standardized assessments an appropriate measure of accountability? Most often, standardized assessments are used to report school level improvement. The practice of linking accountability sanctions to school level performance is likely to create constraints that encourages the selective use of assessment data to improve the schoolwide test score average. Districts need to develop other measures of school performance that support effective school and classroom organization. In addition, ways need to be found to insure standardized assessments are useful to teachers. This means they must by used to provide teachers with knowledge of what an individual student has learned and what remains to be learned, a task vary different from reporting school level performance.

Clearly, more research is needed on the impact of standards-based reform on the curriculum students receive and instructional practices used by teachers. Districts can assist schools by establishing an infrastructure that provides additional professional development specifically design to help schools understand effective uses of their Title I resources. Policymakers need to understand the implications of standards for student learning as well as how schools use their resources in light of the emphasis on accountability as they move forward with Title I schoolwide policy.

References

Barr, R. & Dreeben, R. (1983). *How Schools Work.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Chicago School Reform Board of Trustees (1997). *Expecting More: Higher Standards for Chicago's students, Chicago Academic Standards and Frameworks.* Chicago: Board of Education of the City of Chicago.

Gamoran, Adam (1986). "Instructional and Institutional Effects of Ability Grouping," *Sociology of Education, 59:* 185-198.

Jennings, John, F. (1998). *Why National Standards and Tests? Politics and the Quest for Better Schools.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Kim, Jeong-Ran (1998). "Implementation of Title I Schoolwide Projects and their Impact on Schools." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Conference, San Diego, CA.

Kirst, M. (1988). "The Federal Role and Chapter 1: Rethinking Some Basic Assumptions," in D. Doyle & B. Cooper, eds. *Federal Aid to the Disadvantaged: What Future for Chapter 1?* London: Falmer Press.

Ladd, Helen R., ed. (1996). *Holding Schools Accountable: Performance-Based Reform in Education.* Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

March, James G. & Johan P. Olsen (1989). *Rediscovering Institutions: The Organizational Basis of Politics.* New York: The Free Press.

Millsap, M. A., et al. (1992). *The Chapter 1 Implementation Study: Interim Report.* Washington, DC: The U.S. Department of Education.

Millsap, M. A., Moss, M., & Gamse, B. (1993). *The Chapter 1 Implementation Study: Final Report.* Washington, DC: The U.S. Department of Education.

Mintrom, Michael & Sandra Vergari (1997). "Recent Efforts to Improve Public Education in the United States: Intergovernmental Politics and Accountability Issues." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC.

O'Day, J. A. & Smith, M. S. (1993). "Systemic Reform and Educational Opportunity," in Susan H. Fuhrman, ed. *Designing Coherent Educational Policy.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Powell, Walter W. & Paul J. DiMaggio, eds. (1991). *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Schenck, E. A. & Beckstrom, S. (1993). *Chapter I Schoolwide Project Study: Final Report.* Washington, DC: The U.S. Department of Education, Office of the Undersecretary.

Scott, W. Roosevelt & John W. Meyer (1994). *Institutional Environments and Organizations.* Thousands Oaks: Sage Publications.

Spillane, James F. and John S. Zeuli (1999). "Reform and Teaching: Exploring Patterns of Practice in the Context of National and State Mathematics Reforms," *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 21:* 1-27.

Stringfield, S., Billig, S. & Davis, A. (1991). "Chapter 1 Program Improvement: Cause for Cautious Optimism and a Call for Much More Research," *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 13: 399-406.

Sunderman, Gail L. (1995). *The Politics of School Reform: The Educational Excellence Movement and State Policymaking.* Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Chicago.

Sunderman, Gail L. and Heidi Mickelsen (1998). "Implementing Title I Schoolwide Projects in a Complex Policy Environment: Integrating Standards and School Reform in the Chicago Public Schools." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Conference, San Diego, CA.

Wong, K. K. and Sunderman, G. L. (1997). *The Effects of Local Reform on Title I Schoolwide Projects: Lessons from Philadelphia.* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Conference, Chicago, Ill.

Wong, K. K., Sunderman, G. L., & Lee, J. (1997). "Redesigning the Federal Compensatory Education Program: Lessons from the Implementation of Title I Schoolwide Projects," in M.C. Wang & K. K. Wong, eds. *Implementing School Reform: Practice and Policy Imperatives.* Philadelphia: Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education.

Wong, K. K., Hedges, L.V., Borman, G. D. & D'Agostino, J. V. (1996). *Final Report Prospects: Special Analyses.* Prepared for the U.S. Department of Education, Office of the Undersecretary.

Yancey, W. L. & Thadani, R. (1997). *Identifying Exceptional Schools: Chicago, Illinois.* Laboratory for Student Success, Center for Research on Human Development and Education, Temple University.

Appendix
Chicago Public Schools

Table 1: Summary of Average and Expected Achievement Scores and the Residual for Students at Four Title I Schoolwide Projects, Iowa Test of Basic Skills, Chicago Public Schools, Academic Years 1990-91 to 1995-96

	Math			*Reading*		
School	*Average*	*Expected*	*Residual*	*Average*	*Expected*	*Residual*
Fairfax	27.84	16.94	10.93	15.99	14.61	1.37
Montgomery	28.07	21.17	6.94	23.27	14.14	9.13
Cornell	15.57	22.49	-6.89	11.87	20.27	-8.40
Butler	9.90	18.77	-8.85	11.69	16.87	-5.19

Source: William L. Yancey & Raj Thadani (1997). *Identifying Exceptional Schools: Chicago, Illinois.* Laboratory for Student Success, Center for Research on Human Development and Education, Temple University.

Table 2: Demographic and School Characteristics for Students at Four Title I Schoolwide Projects and the District, Chicago Public Schools, 1996-97.

	Fairfax	Montgomery	Cornell	Butler	District
Enrollment	441	956	667	494	421,334
% White	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	11.3
% African Amer.	100	0.1	100	100	54.7
% Hispanic	0.0	99.0	0.0	0.0	30.6
% Asian	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	3.2
% Native American	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
% LEP	0.0	59.0	0.0	0.0	15.4
% Low Income	95.5	98.1	86.7	99.8	83.2
% Mobility	34.1	24.1	24.5	32.3	29.0
% Daily Attend.	92.7	94.2	91.7	91.9	90.6
Year Schoolwide	1992	1995	1994	1992	

Source: Chicago Public Schools

Table 3: Demographic and School Characteristics for Students at Four Title I Schoolwide Projects and the District, Chicago Public Schools, 1997-98.

	Fairfax	Montgomery	Cornell	Butler	CPS
Enrollment	448	936	659	452	428184
% White	0.0	0.9	0.3	0.0	10.3
% African Amer.	100	0.2	99.7	100	53.7
% Hispanic	0.0	98.9	0.0	0.0	32.6
% Asian	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2
% Native American	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
% LEP	0.0	62.7	0.0	0.0	16.1
% Low Income	96.9	98.0	89.4	98.2	84.8
% Mobility	44.4	29.0	20.1	32.8	28.5
% Daily Attend.	96.9	94.6	92.6	92.5	91.5
Year Schoolwide	1992	1995	1994	1992	

Source: Chicago Public Schools

Table 4: School Budget, State Chapter 1, and Federal Title I Budget for Four Schools with Title I Schoolwide Projects, Chicago Public Schools, FY 1997-98.

School	School Budget	State Chapter 1	Federal Title I	Total Title I	% of Total Budget
Fairfax	$2,441,100	$318,960	$299,398	$ 618,358	25.3%
Montgomery	$4,790,140	$695,996	$338,803	$1,034,799	21.6%
Cornell	$3,056,443	$414,000	$269,703	$ 683,703	22.4%
Butler	$2,888,184	$337,680	$345,064	$ 682,744	23.6%

Source: School budget and *School Improvement Plan for Advancing Academic Achievement*, for each of the four schools, 1997. Data for Montgomery is for 1996-97.

Table 5: Per Pupil Funding: Total School Revenues, Federal Title I, and State Chapter 1, Four Title I Schoolwide Projects, Chicago Public Schools, FY 1997-98.

School	Number of Students	School Revenues	Federal Title I	State Chapter 1	Total Title I
Fairfax	448	$ 5448.88	$ 668.30	$ 711.96	$ 1380.26
Montgomery	936	5117.67	361.97	743.59	1105.55
Cornell	659	4638.00	409.26	628.22	1037.49
Butler	452	6389.99	763.42	747.08	1510.50
District	409,499	2589.14	464.51	637.36	1101.87

Source: School budget and *School Improvement Plan for Advancing Academic Achievement*, for each of the four schools, 1997; Enrollment date, Chicago Public Schools, 1997.

Table 1: Summary of Actual and Expected Achievement Scores and the Residual for Students at Four Title I Schoolwide Projects, California Achievement Test, Reading, Cleveland Public Schools, Academic Years 1995 and 1996

	Actual		*Expected*	*Residual*
School	*1995*	*1996*	*1996*	*1995-96*
Carter	36.7	36.9	42.2	-6.3
McKinley	39.1	36.7	42.1	-4.9
Sherman	49.5	47.9	42.8	5.6
Lincoln	52.0	53.0	43.9	8.0

Source: William L. Yancey & Raj Thadani (1997). *Identifying Exceptional Schools in Cleveland.*. Laboratory for Student Success, Center for Research on Human Development and Education, Temple University.

Table 2: Demographic and School Characteristics for Students in Four Title I Schoolwide Projects and the District, Cleveland Public Schools, 1996-97

	Carter	McKinley	Sherman	Lincoln	District
Enrollment	320	516	616	562	71,344
% White	1.4	2.2	37.2	1.8	
% African American	97.2	97.0	18.0	95.8	
% Hispanic	0.8	0.2	43.4	2.3	
% Asian	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.0	
% Native American	0.6	0.0	0.5	0.0	
% LEP	0.0	0.0	25.4	.0017	
% Low Income	96.2	95.0	95.8	96.3	86.4
% Mobility	32.5	29.0	21.6	16.7	19.6
Year Schoolwide	1996	1995	1989	1990	

Source: Cleveland City School District, Assessment & Information Services, *Building Profiles: Data for 1996-97 School Year, Three-Year Baseline Data, Elementary Schools*, October 1997.

Table 3a: School Budget and Federal Title I Budget for Four Schools with Title I Schoolwide Projects, Cleveland Public Schools, FY 1997-98

School	School Budget	Federal Title I	Title I as % of Total Budget
Lincoln	2,040,671	342,040	16.76%
McKinley	2,170,044	297,160	13.69%
Carter	1,668,817	195,840	11.74%
Sherman	2,260,450	363,800	16.09%
District	650,356,986	34,942,514	5.37%

Source: School Budget for each school 1997-98; district data from *Cleveland City School District Comprehensive Annual Financial Report*, FY 1998.

Table 3b: Per Pupil Funding: Total School Revenues, Federal Title I, Four Title I Schoolwide Projects, Cleveland Public Schools, FY 1997-98.

School	Number of Students	School Revenues	Federal Title I
Lincoln	525	$3886.99	$651.51
McKinley	506	$4288.63	$587.27
Carter	421	$3963.94	$465.18
Sherman	569	$3972.67	$639.37
District	73,312	$8871.09	$471.88

Source: School Budget for each school 1998-99; calculations for each school are our own, district data from *Cleveland City School District Comprehensive Annual Financial Report*, FY 1998.

Detroit Public Schools

Table 1: Summary of Actual and Expected Achievement Scores and the residual for Student at Four Title I Schoolwide Projects, Metropolitan Achievement Tests, Detroit Public Schools, 1996.

	Read			*Math*		
School	*Average*	*Expected*	*Residual*	*Average*	*Expected*	*Residual*
Adams	14	44.6	-30.6	16	42.3	-26.3
Roosevelt	15	36.6	-21.6	21	36.7	-15.7
Washington	58	39.4	18.6	63	38.0	25.0
Sinclair	67	39.1	27.9	59	37.8	21.2

Source: Personnel communication with William L. Yancey, Temple University (September 24, 1997), "Results of Multiple Regression Analyses of Reading and Math Achievement (MAT) Detroit Elementary and Middle Schools, 1996."

Table 2: Demographic and School Characteristics for Students in Four Title I Schoolwide Projects, Detroit Public Schools, 1996-97

	Adams	Roosevelt	Washington	Sinclair	District
Enrollment	460	728	564	781	183,447
% African American	18.0	78.0	95.0	100	90.69
% White					5.23
% Hispanic					2.83
% Asian					1.00
% Native American					.25
% Free & Reduced	71.0	96.0	80.0	68.0	69.87
% LEP					
Attn. Rates					92
Schoolwide since	1995-96	1991-92	1990-91	1995-96	1990-91

Table 3: School Budget, State Section 31A At Risk, and Federal Title I Budget for Four Schools with Title I Schoolwide Projects, Detroit Public Schools, FY 1997-98.

School	School Budget	Section 31A At Risk	Federal Title I	Total Title I	Title I as % of Total Budget
Sinclair	$2,247,929	$212,120	$335,327	$547,447	24.35
Adams	$1,758,293	$129,674	$235,296	$364,970	20.76
Washington	$1,653,073	$164,039	$272,596	$436,635	26.41
Roosevelt	$1,864,470	$235,114	$529,953	$765,067	41.03

Source: Detroit Public Schools, Statement of Expenditures, Summarized by Funding Source, 12-31-97, Prepared by the Office of Financial Analysis, for each school.

Table 4: Per Pupil Funding: Total School Revenues, Federal Title I, and State Section 31A At Risk, Four Title I Schoolwide Projects, Detroit Public Schools, FY 1997-98.

School	Number of Students	Total Revenues	Section 31A At Risk	Federal Title I	Total Title I
Sinclair	781	2878.27	429.36	271.60	700.96
Adams	629	2795.38	206.16	374.08	580.24
Washington	564	2930.98	290.88	483.33	774.16
Roosevelt	728	2561.09	322.96	727.96	1050.92
District		6138.76			

END

U.S. Dept. of Education

Office of Educational
Research and Improvement (OERI)

ERIC

Date Filmed
April 03, 2000